National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-55556-4

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

# THE CULTURAL POLICY FOR EDMONTON: A CASE OF ELITE ACCOMMODATION

by

TIFFANY PUI KEE TSANG

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS IN RECREATION

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND LEISURE STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Fall 1989

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

**RELEASE FORM**

NAME OF AUTHOR TIFFANY PUI KEE TSANG

TITLE OF THESIS THE CULTURAL POLICY FOR EDMONTON: A CASE OF ELITE ACCOMMODATION

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF ARTS IN RECREATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED Fall 1989

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Tiffany Tsang

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

6A, 17TH FLOOR, NASSAU ROAD,

MEI FOO SUN CHUEN, KOWLOON,

HONG KONG

DATED OCTOBER 12 1989

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE CULTURAL POLICY FOR EDMONTON: A CASE OF ELITE ACCOMMODATION submitted by TIFFANY PUI KEE TSANG in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS IN RECREATION.

.....

Supervisor

.....

.....

Date 8/17/89

## Dedication

To my father

**Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to determine if the theoretical framework of elite accommodation and interaction discussed by Presthus was applicable and capable of explaining the evolution of the formally proposed cultural policy for Edmonton.

The research plan was divided into two phases. Phase one consisted of document search and analysis to determine the significant actors involved. Reconstruction of events was conducted based on the documents. Phase two consisted of focussed interviews with representatives of the major elite groups to determine their personal experience with the cultural policy. Historical/comparative analysis was the guideline used in analysis of the interviews.

The study found that the pattern of elite interaction and accommodation was dominant in the policy process, with some actors and interest groups more successful than others. It also found that interest group interaction with legislative elites was more effective than with bureaucratic elites.

Elite accommodation seems to fall short in theorizing the relationship between special bodies such as advisory boards. It is recommended that the role of special bodies in the accommodation process be investigated in the future. Also, the relationship between the different departments of the municipal government was not clear from the study. Further research into the interaction between different government departments in influencing policy process and outcome is worth pursuing.

**Acknowledgement**

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the support I got from family, friends and colleagues while I was writing my thesis.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Leslie Bella, who encouraged me to explore this thesis topic. Thanks to Dr. Thomas L. Burton who supervised and guided me throughout the course of my graduate study. His sound advice and sharp insight were greatly appreciated. Appreciation is also extended to my thesis committee members who gave me feedback and support on my work.

I would also like to thank Donna Cardinal, Director of Arts and Multiculturalism Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, for providing me with access to documents as well as office space for my document search.

This thesis would have been impossible without the cooperation of the many people that I talked to regarding the cultural policy for Edmonton. I am greatly indebted to their generosity with their time and openness.

Last but not least, Candas Jane Dorsey is to be thanked for editing my thesis.

## Table of Contents


| Chapter | Page |
|---|---|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A. The Problem and Its Setting | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | 1 |
| Proposition and Research Questions | 1 |
| Limitations | 2 |
| Delimitations | 2 |
| Assumptions | 2 |
| Significance of the Study | 3 |
| Definition of Terms | 4 |
| List of Major Policy and Position Papers related to the Development of the Cultural Policy for Edmonton | 4 |
| II. THE THEORY OF ELITE ACCOMMODATION AND RELATED LITERATURE | 6 |
| A. Elite Theory of Power Distribution | 6 |
| B. Pluralist Theory of Power Distribution | 9 |
| C. The Theory of Elite Accommodation | 12 |
| D. Elite Accommodation in Analysing Public Policy Issues | 18 |
| E. Implications of Elite Accommodation on Emperical Research | 19 |
| F. Operational Definition of Elite Accommodation | 20 |
| III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 22 |
| A. Part I - Document Analysis | 22 |
| Recording Procedures | 23 |
| B. Part II - Focussed Interviews | 28 |
| The Nature and Advantages of Focussed Interviews | 28 |
| Procedures for Conducting Focussed Interviews | 30 |
| Historical Comparative Analysis | 35 |

IV. ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF ELITES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CULTURAL POLICY FOR THE CITY OF EDMONTON ..... 37

A. Which groups were involved? ..... 37

B. Who were the actors involved? ..... 40

C. What was the extent of their involvement?
Over what time period were the various actors and groups involved? ..... 45

V. ELITE ACCOMMODATION AND INTEREST GROUP INTERACTION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CULTURAL POLICY FOR THE CITY OF EDMONTON ..... 57

A. Interest Groups: Origin, Structure, and Evolution ..... 57

B. Patterns of Elite Interaction and Accommodation ..... 62

Interest Groups and Bureaucrats ..... 62

Interest Groups and Legislators ..... 65

Interest Groups and Appointed Elites ..... 66

Interaction Among Interest Groups ..... 68

C. Political Effectiveness of Interest Groups ..... 70

VI. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 73

A. Summary ..... 73

B. Theoretical Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 74

C. Methodological Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 76

D. Practical Implications of the Study ..... 76

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 78

APPENDIX I ..... 82

APPENDIX III ..... 101

APPENDIX II ..... 102

# Chapter I

# INTRODUCTION

## A. The Problem and Its Setting

### Statement of the Problem

This study examined the theoretical framework of elite accommodation and its related theory of interaction explored by Presthus (1973) "to explain interaction and imputations of legitimacy and influence of interest groups among the Canadian political elite" (Presthus, 1973:ix). Then, the course of development of the present cultural policy for Edmonton was investigated. The purpose of the study was to determine whether or not the theoretical framework of elite accommodation and interaction discussed by Presthus was applicable to, and capable of, explaining the evolution of the formally proposed cultural policy for Edmonton.

### Proposition and Research Questions

The principal research proposition was as follows: that the direction of the formally proposed cultural policy for Edmonton developed through a process of accommodation and close interaction between elites within organized groups and government officials. This proposition was broken down and explored through the following questions:

1. With respect to the functions and characteristics of the elites involved:
   a. Which groups were involved?
   b. Who were the actors involved (usually as group representatives)?
   c. What was the extent of the involvement of each actor or group?
   d. Over what time period were the various actors and groups involved?
2. With respect to elite accommodation and interaction in relation to the evolution of the cultural policy for Edmonton:
   a. Did elite accommodation and interaction occur in this case?

b. If so, __

1) in what ways did it occur?

2) what changes, if any, in policy direction or emphasis occurred as a result of accommodation and interaction?

**Limitations**

This study is subject to three limitations. Firstly, agendas and minutes from confidential and private meetings, as well as confidential documents pertaining to the cultural policy may be inaccessible. Secondly, the quality of data analysis is dependent upon the willingness of pressure group spokespersons and government officials to be interviewed, and to state their positions in such interviews. Lastly, the quality of data collection and analysis will be dependent upon the willingness of interviewees to respond to questions and the accuracy of their responses.

**Delimitations**

Two delimitations are found in this study. On one hand, the study focussed only on individuals or groups involved as active participants at various phases of development of the current cultural policy for Edmonton. On the other hand, the time frame for the study was delimited from 1977, when the first formal and consistent demand for a policy of such nature emerged, to September 1986, when the responsibilities of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board were expanded to incorporate equal representation from the arts community, ethnocultural community, and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues.

**Assumptions**

Three assumptions were made: broadly, the study assumed that power and influence in decision-making are concentrated in the hands of a few key individuals in the political process. This is in contrast to the pluralist view which sees power and influence as being distributed more or less equally among appropriate groups in society. The study also assumed

that resources are in limited supply in any political process, i.e., zero sum game. One group's gain in political power have to be achieved through another group's loss in political power. Therefore, elite accommodation is a process in which different groups involved in the same political process compete for a limited supply of power, political and otherwise, through a process of conflict, bargain and compromise. The documentary analysis in this study assumed that the letters, memoranda, and other correspondence sent by any particular individual or group were received and understood by the addressees.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the study can be discussed in terms of its theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, the study served to verify or refute the applicability of the theory of elite accommodation (which was discussed largely in the federal and provincial policy process) in a municipal setting. Knowledge gained from the study may act as a basis for comparison between the different levels of governments in terms of policy process. Although this case-specific study cannot be generalized to all policy development processes in the municipal level in Alberta, understanding the political dynamics of one case may facilitate the drawing of inferences for other cases on a broader basis.

Practically, the study may be useful to interest group leaders and their municipal government counterparts. By understanding more of the political process involved in decision-making, and specifically, where influence and lobbying can be most effectively exerted, interest groups can venture to develop effective lobbying strategies which aim directly at the key individuals within the system, especially during the times of economic constraints. For government officials who have the responsibility to serve their clients on a daily basis, the study may offer more information concerning the roles, functions and activities of interest groups. This may in turn help the government officials to work with the interest groups in a cooperative fashion.

**Definition of Terms**

**The cultural policy for Edmonton** refers to the various attempts to formulate a single policy document to guide and promote cultural development within the City of Edmonton.

**Multiculturalism** refers to the issues and concerns raised by ethnic groups in the city in the course of development of the cultural policy. It is used interchangeably with the term **ethnoculturalism**.

**Significant actors** refers to individuals or groups of individuals who actively took part in formulating, supporting or opposing the cultural policy proposals during the time period of the study (1977 to 1986).

**Elite Accommodation** refers to the distribution of limited resources among stakeholders in a political process by means of conflict, bargain and compromise.

**List of Major Policy and Position Papers related to the Development of the Cultural Policy for Edmonton**

The following is a chronological list of the major policy and position papers that appeared from 1977 to 1986:

Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee--Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to develop a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton, November 1978.

Edmonton Parks and Recreation--Six background papers on cultural policy:

A Cultural Policy Study Proposal, January 1979

Expression of Culture, March 1979

The Values of the Arts, June 1979

Cultural Services in Edmonton--Identification of Unmet Needs, February, 1980

Cultural Services in Selected Municipalities, April 1980

Cultural Arts Policy--Recommendations for Municipal Action, November 1980

Edmonton Parks and Recreation. The Development of a Cultural Policy for the City of

Edmonton, June 1982

The Edmonton Arts Alliance. The Development of a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton (position paper), July 1982

The Edmonton Visual Arts Committee. Recommendations for the Revised City draft of a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton, August 1982

The Edmonton Committee on Multiculturalism. Multiculturalism: A Component of a Cultural Policy, September 1982

Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Towards an Arts Policy (preceded by the Arts Policy White Paper), May 1983

The Mayor's Task Force On Culture. A Cultural Policy for Edmonton, December 1984

The Edmonton Professional Arts Council and the Edmonton Cultural Caucus. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton, September 1985

Cultural Policy Implementation Committee. With representatives from Edmonton Professional Arts Council, Edmonton Cultural Caucus, Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton. 1986

## Chapter II

## THE THEORY OF ELITE ACCOMMODATION AND RELATED LITERATURE

The study of policy and policy making has become an increasingly important area of research in Canadian politics. The growth in the popularity of policy studies is evident not only in the literature relating to this topic published in various journals of political studies, but also with respect to its occurrence in postgraduate theses and dissertations in recent years (Reynolds 1985, Canadian Political Science Association 1970, 1971-73, 1974-77).

While the study of politics is aimed at "understanding how authoritative decisions are made and executed for a society" (Easton 1957, 383), the study of policy is directed towards an understanding of the "... course of action that the authorities of the political system have decided should become an output" (Van Loon and Whittington 1981, 16). Therefore, based on the action-oriented Eastonian model, examining policy, policy study necessarily involves the investigation of the actors, actions and consequences of certain government decisions. The concern is thereby narrowed down to explaining policy as a means to better understand political reality (Simeon 1976).

The most complex and widely discussed approach to the explanation of policy is the power approach. According to Simeon (1976, 568), the power approach seeks to explain government actions "by reference to the distribution of interests in the society and the resources available to these interests". He also contends that "the pattern of policy will reflect the distribution of power and influence, given certain patterns of division and cleavage" (Simeon 1976, 568). Two major schools of thought--the elitists and the pluralists--have contributed substantially to the conceptualization and description of the structure of power in a society and how this structure, by and large, shapes the policy of that society.

### A. Elite Theory of Power Distribution

The study of the concept of political elites and their relation to the power structure in society has taken several shifts of emphasis since the emergence of elite political theories at the end of the nineteenth century. Classical elitists such as Mosca (1939), Pareto (1966) and

Michels (1958) viewed all societies as occupied by two classes of people--the rulers and the ruled. Elites can be identified as groups of people with varying degrees of cohesiveness who share similar attitudes and conduct (Parry 1969). Mosca and Michels adopted an organizational approach which views elite control as a function of the elite's "capacity to weld itself into a cohesive force presenting a common front to the other forces in society" (Parry 1969, 37). Neo-Marxists such as Burnham (1942) related the trend of increasing industrialization and capitalism in Western society to the change in the power structure and concluded that capitalists, having direct control of a nation's economy and production, were, in fact, the ruling class in society. C. Wright Mills (1956) also studied elitism within the context of the economic and social structure; but he concluded, differently from Burnham, that a nation's "power elite" is a product of the "institutional landscape" of the society. Power, in a modern democracy, is an attribute of institutions (Parry 1969, 52) and the elite is described in terms of potential power, rather than the actual exercise of power.

Regardless of differences in ideological orientation among the elite theorists, a functional definition of the political elite is generally applicable. As suggested by Van Loon and Whittington (1981, 446), a political elite can be defined as "a relatively small group of people who share a relatively large amount of the power to influence policy decisions". Furthermore, Putnam (1976, 3-4) identified a few general principles shared by all elitist theorists. Based on the assumptions that political power is distributed unequally and that there is a group with significant political power while the remainder of the population has little or none, the elite is regarded as homogeneous, unified and self-conscious. It is drawn from a very exclusive segment of society and is essentially autonomous in decision-making.

The critical acclaim received by elite theorists is evident in the studies based on an elitist orientation (e.g. Marick 1977, Moore 1979). Nonetheless, elite theories are not without their shortcomings. Elitism has been criticized in at least three dimensions--ideology, methodology and applicability.

Elitism as an ideology, particularly when used as a strong concept (Forcese 1983), assumes the monopolization of decision making by a coherent minority, while, at the same

time, assuming a general politically apathetic populace. This has been strongly criticized by Walker (1966) as an inaccurate description and as being inadequate in explaining the complexity of Western democratic society. His argument was further supported by Burton (1984) who asserted that the elitist paradigm needed to be strengthened in order to be used as a guiding framework for macro social and political analysis. C. Wright Mills' thesis on the institutionalized power elite was attacked by Dahl (1958) who contended that the measurement of potential for control is not equivalent to actual control. Therefore, measuring potential power may not be useful in the study of political elites, where power over political outcome is the concern. Elitist theories have also provided a weak argument towards explaining the scope of power of the elites in a society. As suggested by Putnam (1976), investigating the "average" power of elites can be misleading in issue-specific cases where certain elites may have more influence than others on policy outcomes.

The weaknesses of the elitist analytical framework have had a direct effect on the research methods used and, hence, on the results of investigations. The most popular strategies for conducting elite studies were the positional and reputational methods. Positional method concentrates on seeking people who are in positions to make decisions having major consequences. Reputational method determines the power elite by asking informants to name people they see as being powerful. However, studies of this type have been criticized as self-serving in that the types of research, findings and conclusions are affected by the researcher's basic orientation to the research problem. More specifically, positional analysis has been criticized as restricted to investigating formal roles, while reputational analysis has the weakness of potentially contributing to a distorted picture of community power if informants have a biased view of the elites in the community.

The application of elite theories to empirical research has largely been confined to community and national power structure and leadership (e.g. Hunter 1963, Mills 1956). On the one hand, research based on elite theories tends to focus upon economic factors and hypothesizes the existence of a clear coherent, omni-powerful corporate elite that runs the country at all levels (Stanislawski 1981). Thus, it is hard to escape the elitist conclusion. On

the other hand, elitist studies concentrate on investigating the power at the top while ignoring issues such as prevailing ideology, dominant ideas, values and beliefs in the society, which are basically phenomena of the masses. Finally, the elitist assumption of a homogeneous and coherent elite is still irreconcilable with ethnic and cultural cleavages across Canada. Therefore, adoption of the elitist approach to explain policy is less than ideal within the social and political setting of Canada.

**B. Pluralist Theory of Power Distribution**

The popularity of the elitist theories of power distribution witnessed major challenges in the 1950's and 1960's when power distribution in modern democratic societies in Western Europe and the United States became more complex and differentiated as a result of widespread economic specialization and differentiation. A branch of political science focusing on pressure group activities arose and the leading scholars in this field, such as Truman (1951) and Dahl (1961), adopted a pluralist perspective on the distribution of power in society.

A close examination of the pluralist model reveals that a pure pluralist view of an open and egalitarian political system, with an equal distribution of power and an equal opportunity to participate for all members of society, is incompatible with the political reality of essentially all democratic societies. Hence, rather than arguing for a cohesive and consistent minority group of power holders, the pluralists see societal power as dispersed among organized groups, thereby acknowledging "a plurality of elites" (Forcese 1983). Parry (1969, 68) understood the term elites, in the pluralistic sense, as weakened "to mean merely the category of 'top persons' in any interest group or in any activity which affects politics".

While the elitists emphasize the power of the ruling oligarchy (among which many belong to the government) in determining policy outcomes, the pluralists see the government as "the focal point for group pressure {whose} task is to effect a policy which reflects the highest common factor of group demands" (Parry 1969, 65-66). Implied in this argument is the competition of interests among groups and the conciliatory mood of the government to

cater for a variety of groups. Political stability is maintained by agreement on the values and rules of the game among the groups. Political polarization and conflict are prevented by what Truman (1951) saw as "overlapping and multiple memberships" of people in the groups.

The pluralist theory of power distribution, once popular in the 1950's and 1960's, has faced its share of criticism as questions and challenges have been posed regarding both the assumptions of the theory and its applicability to political systems other than the United States.

An important assumption in the pluralist model is that of the "overlapping and multiple membership" of citizens in groups as a means to achieve political tolerance and compromise. However, this assumption was challenged by Bhuyan (1983) who cited survey results of major democratic countries which indicated that, firstly, the majority of citizens did not belong to more than one organization, and, secondly, a relationship between group membership and tolerance towards one's political opponent was not established. Pross (1975) further suggested that people may join groups solely to enjoy benefits offered by the groups. Therefore, careful consideration is needed to distinguish between groups and pressure groups, since not all groups operate as pressure groups.

The assumption that all groups are autonomous and compete on an equal footing was also criticized by Bhuyan (1983) as unrealistic. He argued that, in Western industrialized societies, whether a group's interests were represented or not depended on its resources and its ability to organize itself as a pressure group.

General agreement and obedience to the rules of political games as a measure to maintain political stability was challenged by Bhuyan (1983) who argued that such rules are monopolized by powerful and organized groups. There is a lack of explanation as to why the less powerful groups would accept such imposed rules. Besides, the assumption that less powerful groups would adhere to rules imposed by more powerful groups also implies a measure of control and punishment for those who choose to disobey the rules. However, the pluralist model regards the government as nothing more than a reflection of demands from interest groups. Governmental power to control and punish is, therefore, inconsistent with the

ideology of pluralism (Lowi 1969).

The strength of the pluralist model was also challenged when it was tested against different political settings and showed a discrepancy between the theoretical conclusions offered by the model and the political reality in these settings within the United States where this model is most supported. Burton (1984) suggested that pluralist conclusions could not be drawn in the examination of the phenomenon of political conflict involving collective protest. Bhuyan (1983) studied the applicability of pluralism to developing countries and concluded that Lowi's idea of "interest-group liberalism" (Lowi 1969) which is embedded in Western industrial societies failed to explain adequately interest group activities in developing countries. Canadian researchers such as Thompson and Stanburg (1979) in their study of the increasingly important role that interest groups play in the Canadian legislative process, raised doubts about the applicability of American political theory to the Canadian situation. The centralized decision-making in Canada, the existence of stronger party politics, and the reactive as opposed to proactive role generally played by Canadian interest groups are only a few reasons why "interest group representation has less power to explain legislative outcomes in Canada than it has in the United States" (Thompson and Stanbury 1979, 25).

Several points may be made in summary regarding the current situation in the study of policies in Canada. Undoubtedly, increasing attention has been paid to the role of elites and groups in the determination of policy. However, elitist theories tend to assume the existence of a coherent, omnipotent, Canadian corporate elite that controls policy formulation on all issues at all levels. Empirical research has tended to focus on economic factors and on the socioeconomic backgrounds of elites. Pluralist theories have concentrated on the activities of organized, identifiable domestic pressure groups pursuing their own interest and lobbying political leaders. The focus on conflict has resulted in a lack of evaluation of values and goals common to both groups and leaders (Stanislawski 1981). What is needed is an integrated theoretical approach to policy study that accepts the perspectives and incorporates the strengths of both the elitist and pluralist theories. To achieve this, policy should be looked at not only in terms of power distribution but also as a consequence of the process of

decision-making, a complementary approach to the explanation of policy (Simeon 1976).

Rather than separating the process approach from other approaches to the explanation of policy, one should look at process as part and parcel of the greater arena in which political forces operate. According to Simeon (1976, 576), processes are "the bridges on which we work forward from what we know about institutions, ideology, power, etc., to policy outcomes; and on which we work backwards from variations in policy outcomes to seek explanations". Implied in this statement is the benefit of studying the processes of decision-making to bring abstract issues such as power, ideology and other factors into concrete focus. It also takes into account the interrelationships among various political forces in both influencing and being influenced by policy outcomes instead of assuming a straight causal relationship between them. Furthermore, it opens up the possibility of explaining policy by researching on more than one group of actors. Equal emphasis is placed on domestic pressure groups, government decision makers and the general public in determining policy outcomes.

Policy research synthesizing the elitist and pluralist concepts of power and incorporating rival methodologies has been favoured by Canadian political scientists, partly because of the pitfalls of using a single methodology and partly because of the unique Canadian political milieu that calls for what Panitch (1984) has identified as "elite-pluralism". Studies by Porter (1965) and, later, by Clement(1975) and Olsen (1980) originated from an elitist viewpoint of the power structure. However, they fall short of purely elitist conclusions due to the varying degree of integration and competition among elite groups, complicated by the effect of ethnicity in determining entrance to the ranks of the elites.

**C. The Theory of Elite Accommodation**

From the debate between elitism and pluralism arose the theory of Elite Accommodation, developed by Presthus (1973), which attempts to explain the Canadian national power system from both macro and micro levels of analysis. This theory is unique in

three ways. Firstly, it departs from the murky discussion between the elitists and the pluralists and proposes to treat the Canadian political system as a form of consociational democracy. McMenemy (1980, 63) saw the theory as "a concept originating with Arend Lijphart, which seeks to explain why some countries which possess fragmented political cultures are nonetheless stable democracies. At the core of such a 'democracy' is a set of leaders of important groups or sub-elites who choose to govern in mutually supportive ways rather than through basically competitive and stressful relationships". Secondly, it is one of the rare studies that incorporates complementary approaches of power distribution and policy process in explaining public policy. Lastly, it is a theory developed particularly for the Canadian political system rather than an adaptation. Both the theory base of elite accommodation and its application will be discussed below.

Attention to the theory of elite accommodation came about in the 1960s when the Dutch scholar, Lijphart, enriched the study of the typology of Western democratic systems by deliberating on what is called "consociational democracy" (Lijphart 1974) in European countries su as Switzerland, Scandinavia and the Low Countries (Belgium and Holland), all of which are characterized by fragmented yet stable democracies. He attempted to explain the persistence of stable, democratic governments in these kinds of societies which have deep internal cleavages of religion and ethnicity from the standpoint of the rationality, capacity and goodwill of the elites "to stabilize the system by accommodating their differences while defending the particular values and interests of their constituency, or subgroup" (McMenemy 1980, 96).

Lijphart's investigation into consociational democracy and his classification of Canada as a semiconsociational democratic society (1977) became the backbone of Presthus' analysis of the Canadian political system. Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics (Presthus 1973) deals intensely with interest groups on two interrelated levels of functional analysis. Lijphart's theory of elite accommodation serves as the focus for Presthus' system-wide, macro level analysis, while sociologist Homans' (1961) interaction theory is adapted to the operational/micro level analysis. The general explanatory theory encompassed by elite

accommodation evolves inductively from the rather focussed initial theory of interaction upon the process, incentives, and costs of interaction among legislators, bureaucrats, and interest group leaders aiming at mutually satisfactory political decisions (Presthus 1973).

Two major observations of the Canadian political milieu prompted Presthus to hypothesize about the Canadian political process using the theory of elite accommodation. On the one hand, the lack of certain functional requisites[1] of a stable democratic system in the case of Canada renders it inadequate for traditional explanations of political systems. On the other hand, Presthus' assertion that Canada fits into the category of consociational democracies (Presthus 1973, 7) allows him the freedom to seek alternative theories to "explain the Canadian process of government and the vital role of interest groups in that process" (Presthus 1973, 9).

However, Presthus's analytical theory of elite accommodation extends beyond that of the classical consociationalist to include accommodation that occurs within the formal political structure as well as accommodation that occurs between government and the private political elites. His definition (1973, 72) of interest groups as "collectivities organized around an explicit aggregate value on behalf of which essentially political claims are made *vis-à-vis* government, other groups, and the general public" indicates the important position he sees interest groups occupying in determining policy outcomes. To him, the artificial separation of the so called private elites in the institutional sectors from the public elites in the formal apparatus of government is both unrealistic and theoretically inadequate. He suggests a connection between "political elites" as follows: while governmental elites (legislators and bureaucrats) are the central elements in decision-making, the private elites (interest group leaders and their representatives) "assume a critical role in formulating the claims of their various constituencies and hammering out an accommodation among such claims with political elites" (Presthus 1973, 8). Often, the instruments of influence used by private elites are direct personal intervention, lobbying, joint government-institutional committees, and ad hoc

[1]The functional requisites Presthus mentioned include, for example, a pervasive sense of nationalism or collective solidarity, multiple group membership, and two party government. See Robert Presthus, Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics (Toronto: MacMillian Co. of Canada Ltd., 1973).

advisory roles.

To substantiate his argument for elite accommodation in Canadian politics, Presthus further identifies three major characteristics of the Canadian political elite that facilitate the process of accommodation (1973, 11). These have mainly been adapted from Lijphart's work on consociational democracy. Firstly, there is a constant process of personal interaction and interchange of roles among the three elite components: the legislators, the bureaucrats, and the interest group leaders. Secondly, there is a certain degree of shared normative consensus and values among the three elites. Lastly, there is a pervasive homogeneity in the socioeconomic origins of the three elites. These conditions of mutual interaction, shared norms and common social background, argued Presthus (1973, 12), "enable them to interact productively across the conflicting interests of class, region, religion and ethnicity that characterize the highly fragmented Canadian political culture".

Presthus then expanded his argument beyond that of the elites to that of the larger Canadian political culture which is conducive to the process of elite accommodation. Discussion of Canadian political culture is important according to Presthus because "political culture largely determines the legitimacy of both government and interest groups with which it interacts in designing public policy" (Presthus 1973, 20). Furthermore, political culture is understood as citizens' political attitudes, their participation in political affairs, political socialization by the nation's major institutions such as the family and school, and the extent to which citizens regard the political system as reasonably equitable and effective (i.e. legitimate). At least four mutually reinforcing elements of the national political culture helpful to an understanding of the roles of interest groups and the Canadian system of elite accommodation have been discussed in detail (Presthus 1973, 20-63).

The first element has to do with the pragmatic appreciation of government's role in social and economic affairs. With reference to elite (including the three groups of elites) political behavior, Presthus (1973, 23-24) stated the following:

> This affirmative ideology is immediately relevant to elite political behavior in the Canadian milieu. It means that government tends to play an active, brokerage role *vis-à-vis* major social and economic interests. The governmental elite, in a word, invites such groups to organize their claims, rationalize any conflicting demands

> within their various constituencies, and present them as effectively as possible to a government whose definition of its own role is essentially that of allocating public largesse among them. The pragmatic ethic legitimates precisely this conception of government's role.

The second element is the corporatist theory of society with its underlying pluralist ingredient legitimizing normatively and functionally, the role of private groups in the political system. This legitimacy is achieved when "government delegates many of its functions to private groups, which in turn provide guidance regarding the social and economic legislation required in ... modern national{sic} states" (Presthus 1973, 25). Under the corporatist theory, interest groups in Canada enjoy the legitimacy and freedom to put demands to government.

The third element is what Presthus described as differential patterns of authority in interpersonal relations. Traditional, charismatic and the more recent legal-rational systems of authority have been perpetuated by institutional structures and economic development in Canada. The resulting phenomenon is a prevalent normative prescription including tendencies toward elitism, a hierarchical view of society, ascriptive bases of personal evaluation, ambivalence about the alleged materialistic individualism of the United States, and some tension between the preservation of traditional social values and the demands for conditions more appropriate to an industrial society. These differential social assumptions not only provide for a symbiotic relationship between governmental and interest group elites, but also allow for the centralization of power and authority in a small group of people in society.

Closely related to this phenomenon is the last element of "quasi-participative politics" in Canadian political culture. Presthus interpreted the preferences for hierarchy and restricted participation in political affairs by the rank-and-file as a result of the relatively low level of political efficacy felt by the ordinary citizen, as well as the low degree of political interest and commitment among the average Canadian citizen.

In summary, Presthus (1973, 20-21) wrote:

> These components of Canadian political culture, culminate, in turn, in a national political process that may be called one of elite accommodation. Essentially, ... this is a system in which the major decisions regarding national socioeconomic policy are worked out through interactions between governmental (i.e. legislative and bureaucratic) elites and interest group elites.

The term "elite" has been defined by Presthus (1973, 60) as "that minority in any society who

possess and manipulate disproportionate shares of such scarce and highly valued resources as prestige, security, education, income, authority, power, and influence". "Accommodation" is "the outcome of the process of consultation, negotiation, compromise, and conflict whereby such elites allocate public resources" (Presthus 1973, 60).

Politics involving interest groups in Canada is dealt with in detail by Presthus at the micro level using the interaction theory. The definition of interest groups by Presthus (as quoted earlier) not only includes the essential qualities of such groups but also implies a political nature and function for them. The theoretical perspective of elite accommodation illuminates the contributions that interest groups make to the larger political and social system, at the system, subsystem, and individual levels of analysis. However, interaction theory can focus on "explaining the dynamics of personal, face-to-face relationships between interest groups and governmental elites" (Presthus 1973, 88).

According to Homans' (1961) interaction theory, social behavior is "a process of reciprocity or exchange in which individuals initiate and sustain activities and personal interactions that prove rewarding" (Presthus 1973, 92). Presthus expanded this statement to a notation: I-L-I. "I" is the interaction inspired by the accommodation process, "L" is the legitimacy that follows the exchange of reciprocal values, and "I" is the influence which is a behavioral consequence of interaction and legitimacy (Presthus 1973, 93). No matter what form the interaction may take, it can only persist when the actors are personally gratified by it. This gratification, in turn, provides an incentive for further interaction. Frequent and sustained contact thus reinforces the normative solidarity among the actors. Thus, Presthus found the interaction theory valuable as it covers a wide variety of social activities, values, and behavior and is capable of explaining why certain social relationships persist while others languish. Drawing upon interaction theory, the implications become clear, as follows: private elites or interest groups that are capable of maintaining a line of communication and interaction with governmental elites are more likely to be successful in having their demands integrated into the policy process. Therefore, the frequency, duration, and the effectiveness of the actors involved in such interaction may be reliable indicators of the process of elite

accommodation.

Despite considerable acceptance of this theory by Canadian political scientists, full-scale study using it as the basis for analysis is not common. Stanislawski (1981) employed the theory of elite accommodation to investigate the role played by both domestic interest groups and international interests in the Canadian foreign policy decision-making process with specific case reference to the Arab economic boycott of Canadians doing business with Israel. Gitelman and Naveh (1976) have also employed the same theory (and integrated it with modern organization theory) to study the organizational effectiveness of the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption (MIA) in Israel. The two studies are similar in several respects. They are both case studies at a national scale. The research methodology used in both was qualitative. In both, the theory of elite accommodation has been used rather liberally, in the sense that it was integrated with other theories to explain the policy process. However, no study has been found so far where the theory of elite accommodation has been employed to investigate the evolution of a single policy in a smaller setting. It is the contention of the writer that the theory of elite accommodation, at both its micro and macro levels of analysis, can be employed to explain the evolution of a single-issue policy at the municipal level.

**D. Elite Accommodation in Analysing Public Policy Issues**

After the detailed discussion of the theory of Elite Accommodation, it is appropriate to place this theory in the larger context of analysing public policy issues to clarify what elite accommodation attempts to explain. Coplin and O'Leary (1978) claimed that discussion and analysis of public policy were often confused due to the blurring of information needed to answer two interconnected but different questions. The first question deals with evaluating the effects of public policy: i.e., what are the effects of actual policies on various conditions in society? The second question addresses the problems of the "politics of public policy" (Coplin and O'Leary 1978, 3); i.e., how do individuals and groups cooperate and compete in order to support and oppose alternative polices?

Information on three components is required to answer these two questions. **The policy environment** refers to the societal conditions that motivate political actors to action. **Political actors** are individuals and groups that attempt to influence public policies. **Public policies** are composed collectively of governmental laws and activities. Organizing information on these three components will facilitate the exploration of the two questions posed.

When the theory of elite accommodation is fitted into the above framework of policy analysis, it seems that elite accommodation is a theory developed to answer questions pertaining to the processes of public policies and the behavior of political actors. More specifically, the emphasis is on the influence of political actors on policy outcomes. Therefore, the emphasis in this study will be on obtaining information about the other two components: i.e., the political actors and the policies, and seeing how the actors influence the policy outcomes.

**E. Implications of Elite Accommodation on Emperical Research**

The above discussion of the theory base of elite accommodation has two important implications on its application to empirical research. Two interrelated tasks have to be accomplished in order to trace the pattern of elite accommodation in any given political milieu. One task pertains to the conceptualization of the prevailing distribution of power, while the other pertains to tracing the consequences of the process of decision making.

Hence, four major considerations act as the guideline for empirical research which aims at mapping out the process of elite accommodation. Three considerations exist in relation to the conceptualization of the prevailing power distribution, while the fourth relates to the consequences of the process of decision making.

1. **Research method**. In the discussion of elite accommodation, Presthus did not distinguish between power and influence. However, his definition of power as the capacity to achieve one's end despite opposition (1973, 268) would call for the measurement of power by means of active participation in the policy process instead of potential power (as measured, for example, by one's reputation).

2. **Setting**. The theory base of elite accommodation puts the focus on the analysis of interest groups which work towards "translating various kinds of social power into legislative political power to be realized in the government apparatus" (Presthus 1973, 71). The power of interest groups will be evident, according to this theory, if their demands prompt the government into action.
3. **Variables**. Elite accommodation also places emphasis on interest groups themselves to legitimize their power and influence among one another. Therefore, a certain degree of integration among interest groups should be evident if elite accommodation exists in their dealings on any particular issue. However, the general case is that interest groups vary in terms of their organization, philosophy, membership, and the like. Integration among interest groups should take place in the form of social circle interactions. The variables involved are the actors, communication (content, frequency, duration) and the impact upon policy (negotiation or consultation). These variables will be further discussed in Chapter Three.
4. **Perspective**. A study of patterns of elite accommodation using the static (snapshot) perspective is inadequate in examining the consequences of the process of decision making, since the element of time affects the dynamics of interaction. Therefore, if one major policy process in a community is studied from a longitudinal perspective, a common entry point for all actors can be located. The dynamics of interaction among the actors or groups of actors can then be followed.

**F. Operational Definition of Elite Accommodation**

To sum the theoretical discussion of this chapter, as well as to set the stage for the research methodology in the next chapter, it is appropriate to offer a few operational definitions of elite accommodation as the criteria to be used in the study. Based on the assumption of zero sum game, the major reason for such group interaction would be to arrive at equitable distribution of limited resources in the policy process. Elite accommodation is considered to have taken place if the interaction between groups resulted in one or more

group's input being included in the relevant policy proposal. Elite accommodation is said to have occurred if one group's input into the political process resulted in a directional change of the proposed policy in favour of that group. The major indicators of the presence of elite accommodation are both formal and informal interaction among groups in the policy process.

## Chapter III

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In order to analyse the pattern of elite accommodation in the cultural policy development for the City of Edmonton, two basic approaches were used. The first involved an analysis of documents relating to the development of the cultural policy in the City of Edmonton from its inception in 1977 to the passage of Bylaw 8316 to amend the duties of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, in September 1986 (Appendix I). The second involved the conduct of focussed interviews with representatives of the major elite groupings that evolved out of the cultural policy process in order to explore the kinds of informal interactions among these groups which may not be evident from the documents. The snowball technique was employed indirectly for the focussed interviews to ensure that all of the major actors in the process were included in the analysis. Put simply, snowball technique is a method whereby interviewees are asked to identify significant actors in the policy process until all the names are exhausted and no new names are yielded.

### A. Part I - Document Analysis

An in-depth document analysis was employed to reveal the significant actors involved in the policy process. The documents included:

5. City of Edmonton Council meeting minutes;
6. Internal correspondence about the cultural policy among Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff members;
7. Correspondence between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and other government departments on matters relating to the cultural policy;
8. Minutes of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board (formerly the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board);
9. Correspondence, notes, and documents between interest groups and individuals and Edmonton Parks and Recreation;
10. The minutes of interest group meetings;

11. Drafts of the cultural policy proposals;
12. Newspaper articles and editorials reporting or commenting on the cultural policy;
13. Reports and reviews of, and comments upon, policy drafts by Edmonton Parks and Recreation, other municipal government departments and interest groups; and
14. Other miscellaneous records relating to the cultural policy.

**Recording Procedures**

Most of the documents used in the study were located in the archives of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Others were found in private sources by contacting individuals who had been involved in the policy process. A few additional written materials were obtained from the interviewees during the focussed interviews. Photocopies of these documents were arranged in chronological order dating from 1977 to 1988. The documents were analysed in two stages.

Stage I

*Step One*

Each individual's name found in the document was placed on a blank sheet of paper. This was followed by the association or department to which the individual belonged and the position he or she occupied in that organization. The list consisted of people who had written and or received correspondence regarding the cultural policy, people who had attended public or private meetings on it, and, people whose names were included as contributors and/or endorsers of briefs or documents to the government regarding the cultural policy.

The earliest date of each individual's involvement with the cultural policy, as indicated by the documents, was recorded. Then, the series of events relating to the individual as revealed in the documents were recorded chronologically. The summary of each event (e.g. the nature of a meeting, the item of discussion in a letter) was also recorded on the sheet. Particular attention was paid to recording the individual's stand on the matter, whether it was the initiation of a plan, response to a request, clarification of a point or objection to a motion, and so on.

The end product of this stage was a list of 137 individuals whose names were found at least once in the documents. Under each of these 137 names, a chronological order of events relating to that individual's involvement was also completed, thus providing an initial picture of the roles of the individuals in the development of the cultural policy.

*Step Two*

The purpose of this step was to distinguish active participants based on demonstrated involvement in the cultural policy process by means of a second screening. Consideration was given to individuals who made an influential or significant contribution to the policy process regardless of the period of involvement. The criteria suggested by Presthus (1964, 56) were adopted in a modified manner to identify these active participants. Individuals who fell into one or more of the following categories were short-listed as candidates of the elite groupings that evolved from the cultural policy process. Their roles were then analysed in more detail in the next stage. Individuals were considered to be active participants in the process if they:

1. had contributed time and/or money to the process;
2. had participated directly in drafting a document;
3. had participated directly in opposing a proposal;
4. had provided input in written form pertaining to the proposal; and
5. had shown more than one activity entry in the record sheet to demonstrate continuous involvement.

In this screening, no individual showed any contribution of funds to the process. However, using the rest of the criteria, this stage resulted in a list of fifty-three individuals who could be said to have had continuous involvement with the policy. The rest were dropped from further analysis. A look at this group of eighty-four individuals who were eliminated from further analysis revealed the following cursory roles that they had played in the process:

1. External consultants. These were individuals who provided information on similar experiences of cultural policy development to the city of Edmonton. Examples of these included government officials from the cities of Calgary and St. Albert.
2. Internal staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation who provided feedback or technical

information for the six background papers prepared by the Department between April 1979 and November 1980.

3. Individuals who were non-active at, or had no tangible responsibilities in, meetings held to deal with the cultural policy, for example, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board meetings or public hearings on the cultural policy.
4. Individuals who had had only a single input into the entire policy process, such as writing a letter to the City Council. No indication of continued involvement could be traced in the documents.
5. Aldermen who had played no other role in the cultural policy development except voting on the issue in City Council meetings.

*Step Three*

The purpose of this stage was to clarify the roles played by the fifty-three individuals who had been designated as active participants. Each individual's activities in relation to the cultural policy were analysed under four major headings--**identification, type of elite, extent of involvement, and scope of involvement**. The information for each individual was recorded on a separate sheet of paper.

Under the heading of **identification**, the individual's name, the organization he or she belonged to, and his or her position were recorded.

In terms of the **type of elite**, Presthus's classification of legislative elite, bureaucratic elite, and private elite were used. A fourth type of elite was added to this heading out of the need to indicate individuals appointed by the city council to deal with the cultural policy. Therefore, appointed elite was added to the classification.

The **extent of involvement** for each individual was based on the findings of the documents. The dates (day, month and year, if available) of the individual's earliest and latest known dates of participation in the policy process were recorded to indicate the duration of involvement. It was decided that the individual's frequency of participation would not be included in the analysis since there was a divergence arising from mandatory and voluntary involvement. For the bureaucratic elites, such as Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff

members, participation in the cultural policy was part of the job. However, to the interest groups, the motivation to participate in the cultural policy could be that of preserving the group's interests. Frequency of involvement could be skewed toward that of the bureaucratic elites because of their official role in the matter.

The individual's **scope of involvement** was analysed in terms of the organizations with which the individual had communicated regarding the cultural policy. The four basic divisions used were: communication with one's own organization, communication with other organizations, communication with government departments, and communication with city council.

At the end of this stage, individuals who had played similar roles in the policy process were grouped together. The following distribution of actors was revealed:

| | |
|---|---|
| bureaucratic elites | 20 |
| private elites | 14 |
| legislative elites | 8 |
| appointed elites | 8 |
| others | 3 |
| **TOTAL** | **53** |

*Step Four*

A time chart of involvement for each of the individuals was prepared. The time chart for each group of elites was put on a separate graph paper, with their names on the vertical axis and the year on the horizontal axis. Bar charts were drawn representing each individual's involvement with the development of the policy (approximated to the nearest month). The purpose in doing this was to produce information by means of visual presentation to the following questions: which individuals had showed the longest period of involvement in each group of elites; how many years (approximately) had they been involved in the policy process; and what was the cross-comparison of involvement, in terms of length and time frame, for all of the elite groups. It was presumed that this exercise would simplify the process of selecting the individuals to be interviewed.

Stage II

At this point, the documents were analyzed a second time based on their content. The purpose of this was to disclose the events that took place from 1977 to 1986[2] which helped shape the process of the cultural policy for Edmonton. The documents were scrutinized for the activities that took place, the details of the events, and to identify questions that needed further exploration in the interviews. As well, the second scrutiny of these documents provided an opportunity for the index cards with bibliographic records of the documents to be checked for accuracy of entry.

Details of information including important quotations and a summary of what had happened were recorded on five by eight inches cards. Important quotations included arguments between significant actors, debate on policy details, and the use of "strong words" in stating positions among the significant actors in the process. Each event was placed on a single card in order to keep the information simple and succinct. The date that the event took place was recorded on the top left hand corner of the card. The researcher's personal notes or questions were recorded at the bottom of the card. At the end of this stage, a total of ninty-eight cards had been accumulated.

This second round of document analysis was important to the study in two major ways. First, a detailed picture of the course of development of the cultural policy was formed as the basis for the reconstruction of events in the study. Second, it also proved to be of great value in the focussed interview section of the study in allowing the researcher to evaluate the nature and authenticity of the information given by the interviewees. As well, the knowledge of the researcher regarding the course of development of the cultural policy helped to refresh the interviewees' memories of the actual happenings in cases when individuals had ceased to be involved for a considerable period of time.

---

[2]In fact, the development of the cultural policy was traced beyond the time frame of this study in order to obtain a complete picture of its development. Therefore, in both the document search and the interviews, references to the development of the cultural policy beyond September 1986 were taken into consideration.

**B. Part II - Focussed Interviews**

In this section, two major aspects relating to the use of focussed interview will be discussed. The first part deals with the nature of the focussed interview and the rationale for using it in the study. The second part deals with the actual procedures involved in conducting the focussed interviews.

**The Nature and Advantages of Focussed Interviews**

The use of qualitative methods in the study is important because this approach "directs itself at settings and the individuals within those settings holistically: that is, the subject of the study, be it an organization or an individual, is not reduced to an isolated variable or to an hypothesis, but is viewed instead as part of a whole" (Bogdan and Taylor 1975, 4). Developed initially in the field of communications research, the focussed interview has proved to be useful for interpreting statistically significant effects of mass communications, experimental studies of effects, and inquiries into patterned definitions of social situations (Merton, Fiske and Kandall 1956, 5). This method of inquiry differs from other interview techniques in several ways. First, the persons interviewed are known to have been involved in a particular situation. Second, the hypothetically significant elements, processes, patterns and structures of the situation were provisionally analysed through content or situational analysis. Third, an interview guide was developed to ensure that the data obtained from the interview are relevant and can aid in the understanding of the major areas of inquiry, or the hypotheses set forth in the study. Lastly, the interview was focussed on the subjective experiences of persons who were involved in a particular situation in an effort to ascertain their perceptions of that situation (Merton, Fiske and Kandall 1956, 3).

These unique characteristics of the focussed interview provide the following general advantages. After the prior analysis of the situation in which the subjects have been involved, the researcher is equipped with a fairly substantive knowledge of the objective situation.[3] The

[3]Merton et al. suggested prior analysis of the situation as a pre-requisite of focussed interviews. This sets the focussed interview apart from other types of interview methods since the purpose of the focussed interview is not to collect raw

prior analysis, therefore, helps the researcher to explore the subjects' perceptions of the situation and explore the implications of these. By not relying on the interviewee's provision of raw data, the researcher can engage in the interpretation of the things told by the interviewee. The interviewer can also play a more active role by giving explicit verbal cues to elicit a concrete response. Also, any discrepancies between the previous analysis of the situation and the information provided by the interviewee can be detected and interpreted readily. Alternative hypotheses may perhaps be drawn.

When the general methodological framework of using the focussed interview was applied to this study, a few specific advantages were found. First, the development of the cultural policy for Edmonton began in 1977 and has gone through several iterations. Therefore, it was unreliable to depend only on interviewees to provide a full account of the historical background to the development. Previous analysis of documents was carried out in order to obtain a more objective picture of what had happened during the time period of 1977 to 1986. As it happened, some of the interviewees were not totally clear about the exact dates or the specific proposals to which they referred. The interviewer's understanding of the chain of events was, in many cases, helpful in clarifying what it was that the interviewees were addressing. As a result, the interviewees were able to concentrate on their personal accounts of their experiences with the development of the policy. Second, the fact (indicated in the letters sent out to the interviewees) that the researcher had already gained some prior knowledge of the cultural policy for Edmonton might have helped the researcher to gain access to the interviewees more easily. In one case, the interviewee was hesitant to be interviewed until he found out, during the telephone conversation with the researcher, that he was not expected to provide the facts of the matter but rather his insight into it. Third, the focussed interview provided the flexibility, through the use of semi-structured questions, to explore areas of cultural policy which might not have been fully evident in the document analysis. It was assumed, in setting up the research questions, that informal communication and interaction might have taken place and might have played an important part in the development of the

[3](cont'd) data but to facilitate the interpretation of data.

policy. Interviews with the people who had been involved with the process would shed light on this aspect of the policy process which might be impossible to detect from the documents. Also, issues important to the actors involved would emerge from the information they provided. This could then be compared with the findings from the document analysis for purposes of verification. Finally, the use of the focussed interview also guarded against the commonly discussed problem of elitist oriented research methods which may inadvertently lead to conclusions that confirm the existence of elites in the policy process. By looking at the documents and choosing interviewees based on the document analysis, the problem of taking on a reputational bias was reduced.

**Procedures for Conducting Focussed Interviews**

Before the actual steps taken to carry out the focussed interviews are discussed, a few introductory remarks must be made. Consideration was given in the study to limitations of time and human resources, representation, and the anonymity of respondents.

Because of the limitations of both time and human resources to transcribe the interviews, as well as the expectation that much of the information would be similar to a great extent, only a representative few of the fifty-three significant actors identified in the document analysis were approached to be interviewed. The purpose was mainly for the researcher to detect any unanticipated or previously undisclosed facets of the cultural policy for Edmonton through more detailed inquiry.

A further decision was made not to interview any officials from municipal government departments other than Edmonton Parks and Recreation. This decision was based on the documentary findings which indicated that the involvement of other government departments, though consistent, was strictly reactive in response to requests from Edmonton Parks and Recreation and the City Council. In addition, the roles played by this group of actors were distributed evenly among three or four departments and none of them stood out from the document analysis as having a major proactive role in the policy process.

Since it was not possible to interview all of the significant actors, attention had to be given to ways of ensuring that there would be fair and equal representation from all of the major groups of elites disclosed in the documentary analysis. A few criteria were employed in choosing the interviewees. First, whenever possible, the actors with the longest period of involvement in each group of elites were chosen to be interviewed. Second, individuals whose roles were not clear from the documentary analysis were also approached to be interviewed. Third, representation from all three major interest groups revealed in the documentary analysis was obtained in the interview list.

Since the cultural policy for Edmonton is an ongoing process with many of the same actors still involved, it was felt that the anonymity of the people interviewed would be kept in order to encourage a greater degree of willingness and openness in answering the questions. Therefore, in the discussion of the propositions, the comments and opinions given by the interviewees will not be attributed to particular individuals. This was achieved by not revealing their names throughout the discussion in the study.

Eight individuals were singled out at the end of the documentary analysis to be interviewed. The person with the longest history of involvement with the cultural policy for Edmonton (excluding officials from government departments other than Edmonton Parks and Recreation) was picked from each major elite group. A representative was chosen from each of the following major elite groups: legislative elites, appointed elites, arts advocacy, ethnocultural advocacy, Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, and Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Three other individuals had a pronounced, but unclear, role in the development of the policy. A preliminary interview with one person (April, 1988) revealed that she acted as the moderator in the Performing Arts Workshop held in March 1982. Her later involvement with the Cultural Futures Project went beyond the time period delimited at the beginning of this thesis. Therefore, she was not counted as an active participant in the development of the cultural policy. The other two individuals were approached for interviews in order to provide further information regarding their involvement in the development of the policy.

## Pre-Interview

These eight individuals were each sent a letter explaining the purpose of the study and including a request for their participation in the interview. A letter of transmittal from the thesis advisor of the study was also included (Appendix II). About one week after the letters were sent out, the individuals were contacted by telephone. Five individuals accepted the invitation immediately and appointments were made for an interview at a later date. An ex-member of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, agreed to be interviewed if another ex-member of the same board, could also be brought into the interview. It had been revealed in the documentary analysis that the individual named had also played an important role in the policy process. In fact, her name was found in the list of the fifty-three revealed in the document analysis. Therefore, it was agreed that the two individuals would be interviewed together.

Alderman Ron Hayter declined to be interviewed for reasons of his heavy workload at City Hall. It should be noted that Alderman Hayter was approached for interview as the representative from the legislative elites not only because of his long involvement in the cultural policy. His position of opposing the recommendations made by the Mayor's Task Force On Culture and his apparent ties with the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues were the points of interest for investigation. The group of legislative elites was reviewed again for a replacement. However, all of them showed participation in the process only to fulfill their aldermanic duties in City Council. Therefore, no attempt was made to interview another legislative elite. Laurence Decore had moved on to provincial politics. He was contacted several times and no definite answer could be obtained as to his willingness or availability to be interviewed. Ultimately, he was considered to be unavailable for interview.

It was decided that a list of questions would be used to guide the conversation (Appendix III). Rather than limiting the interviewee's range of themes, this list of questions was designed in such a way that the interviewee was encouraged to express his or her opinion freely by answering open-ended questions. This was to safeguard against the interviewee not knowing what and where to begin. It also increased the chance that the researcher would be

able to gather useful and relevant information in the maze of happenings relating to the development of the cultural policy. The questions were pre-tested with an Edmonton journalist, Allan Sheppard, who had been observing the cultural policy for Edmonton on an ongoing basis. The wording of some questions was altered after the pre-test to reflect clearer and more precise directions.

At one time, direct snowball technique was considered for use in the interviews. However, three considerations were taken into account which resulted in the use of the snowball technique in a modified form. First, since the focus of the interview was on the interviewees' personal experience with and insight into the cultural policy for Edmonton, a shift of focus to other people's involvement might be distracting. Second, the individuals were involved for different lengths of time and at various points in time. Their nomination of others to be interviewed could be incomplete and biased. Lastly, since the cultural policy for Edmonton is still ongoing with some of the interviewees still actively involved, soliciting names might affect the willingness of the interviewees to cooperate in an open discussion. Therefore, it was decided that the questions would be constructed in such a way that the interviewees would be encouraged to suggest the names of other involved individuals with whom they had had contact. However, they were not directly asked to suggest any further persons for interview.

Upon completion of the interviews, the transcripts were scrutinized for names suggested by the interviewees. In all, thirty-two persons were mentioned by the seven interviewees. Only six were ones who had not been recorded through the documentary analysis. Out of these six, two were only active after 1986, and were thus discounted. Two were added to the list of actors from the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. One was a member-at-large of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. One was a previous employee of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Their names were entered into the time charts accordingly. The revised distribution of actors at the end of the interview phase was adjusted as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| bureaucratic elites | 22 |
| private elites | 16 |
| legislative elites | 9 |
| appointed elites | 9 |
| **TOTAL** | 56 |

Interview Phase

All of the interviews were conducted personally by the writer of the study. The interviews ranged from fifty minutes to one and a half hour in length, with the average length being approximately one hour. Permission was obtained from all the interviewees before the beginning of the interview to tape-record the conversations. An introduction was read to all the interviewees at the beginning of the interview. The list of open-ended questions was arranged under five major headings. The interview was focussed in the sense that the interviewee was required to address the questions in his or her own words during the interview. The five areas dealt with were: first, the background information relating to the interviewee's involvement with the cultural policy; second, the interviewee's knowledge of the communication patterns in the policy process; third, the interviewee's insight into the policy process itself; fourth, the interviewee's assessment of changes in policy direction; and fifth, the interviewee's personal assessment of the policy process. As suggested by the use of subjective words in the topic areas, attempts were made to tap into the interviewees' personal experiences and interpretations of the policy process. As much spontaneity as possible was kept by allowing the interviewees to spend as much time as possible on any topic area or question. Further questions could be asked by the interviewer in the course of the interview for each interviewee to clarify or elaborate particular statements or positions. In many cases, a group of questions was presented within a topic area in order to avoid repetition and to give a better sense of continuity. In some cases, the interviewer was asked to clarify the questions as well. All the interviewees were given a copy of the questions at the beginning of the interview as a visual aid. Most of the interviewees referred to it only periodically. One person left it aside completely, while two preferred to read the questions on the list rather than to be

asked orally by the interviewer.

At the completion of the interview phase, a total of seven individuals had been interviewed in six interview sessions. All of the interviews were deemed useful in preparing the final analysis of the cultural policy for Edmonton.

Post-Interview Phase

*Transcription and Analysis*

This step involved the transcription of the tapes from the focussed interviews and the conduct of a historical comparative analysis of the resultant transcripts based on the five major topic areas. The tapes were transcribed into 235 double-spaced handwritten pages. The exact wording of the interviewees was recorded as much as possible. Attention was paid to the expression of feelings and the perceptions of the interviewees on the subject matter.

After the transcription of the tapes, the content of the transcripts was written in summary form on separate sheets of paper with the interview questions written at the top. As there were a total of seventeen questions in the five topic areas, seventeen separate answer sheets were prepared. Organizing the responses in this way served three purposes. First, the interviewees tended not to follow the exact order of the interview questions in making responses. Responses to the same questions might therefore be scattered throughout the interview. This exercise allowed for the grouping of responses by reference to each question. Second, it made easy the evaluation of the range of responses to each question. Lastly, it allowed for contrast and comparison to be made on the responses from different individuals.

**Historical Comparative Analysis**

The following is a discussion of historical comparative analysis, the methodology used to analyse the interviews. According to Babbie (1986), historical comparative analysis differs from other unobtrusive research methodologies in the sense that, rather than using a snapshot approach to examine one phenomenon at one time and in one locale, it focuses on "tracing the development of social forms over time and comparing those developmental processes across cultures" (1986, 290). There is practically no limit to the kinds of data that one can

use in conducting a historical comparative study. However, from the studies mentioned by Babbie, existing statistics, official documents, private documents, mass communications, policy statements, speeches and others have all been used in this type of study. Reliability in the study is dependent on **corroboration**; i.e., if several sources point to the same set of "facts," the researcher's confidence in them might reasonably increase (Babbie 1986, 294).

As far as the analytical technique is concerned, little has been suggested in the way of rigorous steps to be taken in the analysis of the data. This is because qualitative methods are generally more flexible in terms of data treatment. It was also suggested that conclusions drawn from qualitative research methods are more debatable than conclusions drawn from quantitative methods. However, historical comparative studies often try to achieve one or more of the following outcomes. First, the researcher must find patterns among the voluminous details describing the subject matter of the study. Then a conceptual model or hypothesis may be developed out of the patterns. Or, the research findings can be used to determine if the particular study can be understood in terms of a larger theoretical paradigm. Occasionally, historical comparative studies can also be used to replicate prior studies in new situations or in a different context. In short, the aim of historical comparative analytical techniques is to make logical sense out of the voluminous and often chaotic collection of data.

The nature of this case study was deemed to be applicable for a historical comparative study in several ways. First, it was a historical longitudinal study of a subject matter, namely, the cultural policy for Edmonton. Second, the aim of the study was to determine if the policy development can be satisfactorily explained by the larger theoretical framework of elite accommodation. Third, the data collected could not be analysed, to any satisfactory extent, quantitatively. Therefore, the emphasis in the analysis of the interview transcripts was upon finding patterns among the various aspects of the development of the cultural policy for Edmonton.

## Chapter IV

## ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF ELITES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CULTURAL POLICY FOR THE CITY OF EDMONTON

The discussion in this chapter is aimed at relating the theory of elite accommodation to the case of the cultural policy for Edmonton. Therefore, the emphasis is on the patterns of interaction between the interest groups and other elites in arriving at agreeable solutions to the cultural policy problem. However, the combined results of documentary analysis and the interviews indicated that elites other than those represented by interest groups had been involved in the policy process. It was decided therefore that two separate parts would be presented in this chapter to serve two distinct purposes.

The functions and roles of elites will be discussed in the first part with an emphasis on their self-initiated actions without the presence of interest group activities. Findings relating to four of the original research questions will be discussed in three sections. The first two questions (Which groups were involved? Who were the actors involved?) will be discussed individually. The third and fourth questions (What was the extent of their involvement? Over what time period were the various actors and groups involved?) will be discussed together. This is because both the documents and interviews indicated that the various elite groups were involved at different time periods and had taken part in a multiplicity of roles with reference to the development of the policy. Therefore, it was important to examine their changing roles in relation to the different time periods during the course of development of the cultural policy. The roles and functions of each major elite group (other than the private elites) from 1977 to 1986 will be discussed.

### A. Which groups were involved?

In general, Presthus's classification of the three major elites--legislative, bureaucratic and private--made up the three major groups of actors in the development of the cultural policy in Edmonton. Two more groups were revealed at the end of the document search which did not fit comfortably into Presthus's description of the three elite groups. One group

consisted of eight individuals who were involved in the cultural policy as a result of appointment by the municipal government. This group was thus named "appointed elites". The other group consisted of three individuals. They were placed in the category of "others" due to their multi-faceted yet relatively unclear involvement (based on the documentary analysis). Since it was difficult to place them in any one of the established categories, a separate category was created to accommodate them.

The largest group of elites found consisted of the **bureaucratic elites**, which totaled twenty-two individuals. Within this group were two distinct categories of actors. First were fifteen staff members of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, who showed the most involvement from any single organization in the development of the policy. Their roles were diverse and underwent considerable changes, from direct drafting of the policy to a consultative role and then to a mediatory role during the development of the cultural policy. Second, there were seven officials from other municipal government departments who played a largely consultative role with Edmonton Parks and Recreation, particularly in assessing the legal and financial implications of the cultural policy proposals.

The second largest group of active participants in the cultural policy development were the **private elites**, which consisted of sixteen individuals. While their official association with organizations, and their roles and functions as interest groups, will be discussed in the latter part of this chapter, it should be pointed out that they can be subdivided into the three major interest groups that dominated the discussion of the cultural policy, especially after 1982. The three groups were the arts community (eight actors), the ethnocultural community (four actors), and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues (four actors).

The study also revealed the active participation of nine individuals in the category of **legislative elites**. Their involvement was mainly directed at transforming the cultural policy proposal into a municipal bylaw at the later stages of the policy process. It should be noted, however, that one member of the City Council, David Leadbeater, was the initiator of a series of discussions about potential ways to upgrade the cultural commitment of the City of Edmonton in 1977. The other important individual was Laurence Decore, who played a vital

role in the development of the policy. His personal association with multicultural interest groups before becoming the Mayor of Edmonton in September 1983 eventually led to a dramatic shift of direction in development of the cultural policy for Edmonton, resulting in the establishment of the Mayor's Task Force on Culture and its subsequent report, which combined the concerns of both the arts community and the ethnocultural community in one policy proposal.

A fourth category of nine elites was added to the classification during the documentary analysis stage to distinguish the distinct roles played by a group of people whose formal involvement with the cultural policy for Edmonton was through the appointment by City Council. Although these actors might have had affiliations with particular interest groups in the process, their appointments were often independent from their interest group affiliations. Instead, their nomination to work on the cultural policy for Edmonton was seen as being related to their knowledge of and expertise about the cultural milieu of Edmonton. Involvement of these **appointed elites** was evident in two separate time periods. One was in 1978 when the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee was appointed to draft a cultural policy proposal to be reported to City Council. The second, and more sustained period, was from 1982 to 1985 in the form of involvement through the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board.[4]

The fifth category of actors, consisting of three individuals classified as **"Others"**, was dissolved after the interview stage. Their roles and involvement were clarified to the extent that they could be assimilated into the four existing categories of actors. The total number of active participants in the cultural policy for Edmonton was fifty-six in four categories after the interview phase.

---

[4]Bylaw #4895, a bylaw to establish a Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board was passed by the Edmonton City Council in September 8, 1981. This bylaw replaced the former Edmonton Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and Cultural Committee and combined the duties of the two bodies under one board.

**B. Who were the actors involved?**

Three introductory remarks will be made regarding the discussion of this research question. First, individual involvement in the cultural policy for Edmonton will be analysed and discussed based on the **primary** roles played in the policy process. The emphasis is on the primary impact that individual had in influencing the policy direction. Second, the chronological development of events has been taken into account. The actors' involvement will be discussed chronologically to provide a continuing picture of their involvement during the policy debate. Lastly, this section will map out the history of the evolution of the cultural policy for Edmonton by placing both the actors and the relevant policy papers in chronological order. It was felt that the reconstruction of the major events relating to the policy should be included as an essential part of the study.

Alderman David Leadbeater was responsible for initiating the cultural policy process when, in 1977, he requested (Edmonton City Council Minutes, July 12, 1977):

> That the City establish an Ad Hoc Committee to be appointed by the Legislative Committee consisting of representatives of the arts and members of the city administration whose purpose would be to develop a cultural policy for the City of Edmonton.

Ensuing discussion in City Council meetings in the latter half of 1977 indicated that the Alderman was striving for more emphasis on cultural programming and support in Edmonton Parks and Recreation as the municipal department which had the responsibility for providing cultural services to the city. Two major points about the initial request were important to the subsequent development of the policy. On the one hand, it started the process within Edmonton Parks and Recreation to evaluate its role in cultural programming from an administrative point of view, which resulted in the Department's own version of a cultural policy in 1980. On the other hand, Alderman Leadbeater's definition of culture referred essentially to the arts. This definition of the term culture eventually turned into a highly debatable political issue in terms of who and what should be included in the policy, as the term culture was understood and interpreted by different people in very different ways.

Two separate developments occurred during the years from 1978 to 1980. First, City Council decided to establish an ad hoc committee to examine the cultural scene in Edmonton

and to develop a policy proposal to be presented to City Council. Four past members of the Cultural Committee and a representative of Edmonton Parks and Recreation were appointed to the **Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee**. Kathleen McCallum, an Alderman who had been vocal in promoting the support of the arts in City Council, was named by the members to chair the committee. The others members were K. Higham, B. Johnson, R.P Wekherlien, and George Earle representing Edmonton Parks and Recreation). Discussions also involved the General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, V. Kondrosky. The Mayor (at that time, Ces Purves) was also consulted for clarification of the city's role in cultural development. Signs of the involvement of private elites, though on a very small scale, were evident as early as 1977 when David Grimes wrote to the city voicing the needs and concerns of visual artists. It was also the position of Edmonton Parks and Recreation that the public be consulted in the drafting of the policy. This notion, however, was turned down, as K. Higham raised the concern that the unclear definition of the term culture would only hinder the effective participation of the public in the process (Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee, Minutes of Meeting #1, May 19, 1978). Therefore, the report prepared by the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee was a private document to City Council. However, the proposal by the Ad Hoc committee to establish a permanent Cultural Advisory Committee was defeated. Instead, the proposed terms of reference of the above committee were incorporated into the bylaw for the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, to allow for representation of the arts by adding a cultural sub-committee to the Board. The first three members in this sub-committee were Cora Molstad, Kathleen McCallum and Krishan Joshee.

The second theme during the years from 1978 to 1980 had to do with activities with Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Attempts were made to prepare an administrative proposal for cultural policy. The Cultural Planner, Donna Davies, gathered information from District Recreation Coordinators to prepare a series of six background papers. Other staff members who had a major role to play at that time were Dave DeShane, the Manager of the Planning and Development Branch, and Richard Nuxoll, the Director of Research and Planning. This stage also saw the involvement of other government departments in a consultative capacity to

Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Since Edmonton Parks and Recreation had the bureaucratic responsibility to consult with the Commissioner of Public Affairs, A.H. Savage, he was the first to be consulted in this part of the cultural policy proposal.

From 1981 to 1984 was a period of heightened involvement with the cultural policy, both within Edmonton Parks and Recreation and by private interest groups. According to two interviewees, the attempts within Edmonton Parks and Recreation to recommend a cultural policy did not succeed. Enneke Lorberg was given credit for "kick-starting the process" within the Department of Parks and Recreation in a different direction to that previously taken. As the Social/Cultural Planner, she started a series of dialogues with arts groups in the city. As one person suggested in the interview:

> I think probably Enneke, by going ahead without asking for permission, started the whole process in the early 1980s. There were public meetings that kick started the process... She basically started the process for which she had no authority. That opened a major can of worms, a major issue that eventually became a political hot potato.

By November 1981, a project was set up to prepare a draft cultural policy for City Council, with Wanda Wetterberg as the Project Leader. Other Parks and Recreation staff members involved were Bryan Monaghan, Director of Operations Resource and Analysis; Lise Hill of Policy and Planning; and Walter Walchuk, the Manager of the Policy and Planning Branch and the person to represent Edmonton Parks and Recreation to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. Two workshops resulted from these dialogues, one for the performing arts and one for the visual arts, held in March and May, 1982, respectively. Clive Padfield acted as the Keynote Speaker for both workshops and was later actively involved as a consultant for the Edmonton Arts Alliance. Two organizations evolved out of these workshops: the Edmonton Visual Arts Committee, whose active members included Maggie Morris (Chairperson), Helen Collinson and G. Guillet; and the Edmonton Arts Alliance whose most active members were Stan Ware, Brian Paisley and Reg Silvester. The discussions eventually led to the preparation of position papers submitted by the two organizations to Edmonton Parks and Recreation as reaction to its draft policy, The Development of a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton(June 1982).

In the same time period, the ethnocultural community became formally involved with the development of the policy, first as participants in a multicultural workshop held by Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Its involvement intensified as a result of the Arts Policy White Paper (November 1982) advocated by the arts community and Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Active members from the ethnic community included Krishan Joshee, Fred Jajczay, Manoly Lupal, David Bai and Al Iafolla. Laurence Decore was the Chairman of the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism and was the Keynote Speaker at the Multicultural Workshop.

The Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board was also involved in the discussion among the interest groups during that time. Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board members were invited to the workshops, as well as being sent copies of the draft policy for review. Members from the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board who were actively pursuing this issue were Cora Molstad (Chairperson), Mike Hodgins and Marianne Budnitsky. Officials from other municipal departments who were consulted included Alex Szchechina (Grants Coordinator, Finance Department), S. Dietze (Commissioner of Public Affairs), Doug Milne (Senior Corporate Planning Officer, Corporate Policy Planning Office), and D. Lychak (Board of Commissioners).

Dispute between the arts and ethnocultural communities was evident during 1982 and 1983. The efforts of the arts community resulted in the document Toward an Arts Policy (May 1983). But this was strongly criticized by the ethnocultural community as inadequate in representing the city's ethnocultural needs. Within the ethnocultural community, interest was expressed in developing a separate multicultural policy. However, the direction of development shifted when Laurence Decore became Mayor of Edmonton in September, 1984. He was responsible for establishing the Mayor's Task Force on Culture to re-direct the development of the policy. Five members from each of the arts and ethnocultural communities were appointed to work with the Chairman, Alderman Percy Wickman. The two components worked mainly independently, with some joint meetings, and a report was presented in a public meeting in April, 1984.

Two more developments took place as a sign of reaction to the Task Force report. Since the Task Force was formed as an independent body directly reporting to City Council, there was little communication between the Task Force and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. The Task Force Report was not accepted by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, and the Board attempted to write its own recommendations. Bill Maxim was the Board Chairman at that time. In the meantime, the Edmonton Professional Arts Council was formed, with Peter Carter (Edmonton Art Gallery) as the Chairman, to respond to the Task Force report. This action helped persuade the ethnocultural community to set up the Edmonton Cultural Ca[illegible]s, made up of the five ethnocultural members of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture, to balance their power.

1984 was also when the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues formally joined the cultural policy discussion as a reaction to a potential threat it saw in the proposals of the Task Force report. Active members from the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues in the policy debate were Bill Marshall, John Sutherland and, later, Brian Sugiyama and Heni Fritz. Two Aldermen were on opposing sides of the Task Force proposal. Julian Kinisky urged the city to support the Task Force recommendations, while Ron Hayter opposed them.

Involvement by Edmonton Parks and Recreation was evident again during the negotiations among the major elite groups, with Barry Anderson being assigned the task of consulting with the groups and interpreting to City Council their demands for amendments to the bylaw to reflect equal representation from the major interest groups. Eventually, a proposal was submitted to City Council which received input from all the major elite groups. City Council Aldermen who were involved in the debate on the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board bylaw amendments were Gordon Wright, Betty Hewes, Olivia Butti and Ed Leger. The amendments were eventually passed in October 1986.

Two general comments will be made about the actors in the cultural policy for Edmonton. The first deals with the official positions held by the elites. The second deals with the various shifts in the elites' positions that occurred within the policy process.

Investigation into the positions held by individuals representing the elites suggested that they held key positions in an organization, or at a senior administrative level in the civic departments. Of the sixteen actors from the private elites, eleven held the position of director or chairperson of the organizations to which they belonged. The same phenomenon was echoed among the bureaucratic elites. All of the officials from departments, other than Edmonton Parks and Recreation, were senior administrators. Active participants from Edmonton Parks and Recreation, however, can be divided into two sub-groups. All the general managers were involved as representatives of the whole department. Below them was a group of directors or heads of branches who had been involved in the details relating to the policy.

Shifts in position had also occurred during the course of development of the policy. This means that the same actor might have shifted his/her association or affiliation from one group to another. While this phenomenon was detected among private elites, the effect was much more dramatic when these private elites, who acted as representatives of their respective interest groups, were pooled together to work for the Mayor's Task Force On Culture, a special body that reported directly to the Mayor of the city. Before the Mayor's Task Force On Culture was struck, a deadlock was found between the arts and the ethnic communities regarding what direction the cultural policy should take. The major disagreement lied in the different interpretations of the term "culture". Decore's involvement directly brought the two groups back to negotiate, and eventually, arrive at a much more aggressive cultural policy proposal.

**C. What was the extent of their involvement?**

**Over what time period were the various actors and groups involved?**

In this section, attempts to develop a cultural policy for Edmonton by the various elite groups, independent of interest group activities, will be discussed. Among the four groups of elites, only the appointed elites and staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation had been involved in drafting cultural policy proposals without the involvement of interest groups.

Both the scope and the extent of their involvement will be explored in detail. The roles and functions of the officials from other municipal government departments will also be included in this section. It is felt that although this group of elites was never actually involved in drafting the policy, its reactions and decisions were, at various points, crucial in terms of changing the direction of development of the policy.

Active involvement of appointed elites was evident during two distinct periods. The first was during the year 1978 when a group of five individuals was appointed by the City of Edmonton Council to prepare a cultural policy, as a result of the request made by Alderman David Leadbeater to evaluate and upgrade the cultural development of the city. The other distinct period of involvement by appointed elites was different in that the appointed elites were the members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, an advisory board that had been in existence officially since 1981, and which protested the terms and conditions of A Cultural Policy for Edmonton put forward by the Mayor's Task Force on Culture in late 1984.

A few important events preceded the establishment of the cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee in 1978 by City Council as the body to oversee the drafting of a city cultural policy. Discussion of the need for a cultural policy for Edmonton began in 1977 after Alderman Leadbeater attended a national conference on Municipilities and the Arts and brought to City Council the request to evaluate the work of Edmonton Parks and Recreation in the area of culture. His reasons for this request were threefold (Minutes of City Council Meeting July 12, 1977). First, there was a lack of both direction and organization within the city administration, which had developed few strategies to promote the arts other than to give out grants. Second, both the department and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board seemed to be involved mainly in the provision of recreation opportunity. A balance was sought between the arts and recreation. Lastly, a municipal body to look into the availability of funding to the arts from both the federal and provincial governments and to oversee the overall development of culture in the city did not exist.

The report prepared by Edmonton Parks and Recreation in January 1978 indicated that in order to upgrade the cultural involvement of the Department, a municipal cultural policy was necessary. The report further suggested that past members of the Cultural Committee, which had existed since 1972, should work cooperatively with Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff representatives on the development of the policy (Edmonton Parks and Recreation January 1978) This report was adopted by City Council and the first attempt to draft a cultural policy for Edmonton took place from March to October, 1978.

As far as the scope of involvement was concerned, the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee communicated in three different ways during its term.

Much of the communication took place in the form of committee meetings where the committee members exchanged ideas with each other and with the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Three major issues were evident from the minutes of the meetings. First, the Ad Hoc Committee was uncertain of its mandate regarding the cultural policy as this was not clearly explained to the members when they were appointed to the committee. Second, the members were not certain of the definition of "culture" and a great deal of debate within the meetings was focussed on arriving at a satisfactory definition of the term. Lastly, the potential political sensitivity of the final cultural policy proposal was also discussed and specific reference was made to the inclusion of ethnic groups into the policy statement.

Communication with other government departments was mainly limited to the City of Vancouver where a similar committee had been established to create an arts policy. This pattern of consulting with other Canadian cities on the issue of cultural policy was repeated in 1979 when the Cities of Calgary and St. Albert were consulted about their experiences with the development of a cultural policy.

Communication with City Council was done only through conversation between the Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Committee, Kathleen McCallum, and the Mayor of the city, Ces Purves. However, these conversations revealed the City's limited commitment to the cultural policy at the time. At a meeting between McCallum and Purves to obtain the Mayor's definition and concept of culture and his expectation of the committee, it was made known to

the committee that the committee "should not deal with financial considerations for cultural development and should confine itself to attempting to establish the broad policy guidelines originally requested" (Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee, 1978). Furthermore, the terms of reference and direction that were promised to the Ad Hoc Committee by the Mayor were never received. The Ad Hoc Committee eventually had to approach the cultural policy by attempting to write its own terms of reference. According to an interviewee, the City Council in the 1970s had very little knowledge of the arts and it was extremely difficult to convince the Aldermen to support arts organizations.

The Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee was involved to a limited but significant extent in three different ways. First, it started the accumulation of reference materials regarding the subject of cultural policy development by Edmonton Parks and Recreation, which proved to be useful in the latter's efforts to prepare a cultural policy. Second, it set the direction for discussion about the cultural policy in the following few years, when the definition of culture mainly referred to the arts. Lastly, because of the structure of the Ad Hoc Committee which included the active participation of Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff, it also provided a chance for Edmonton Parks and Recreation to continue its efforts beyond the cultural policy in 1979, when the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee's proposal was rejected by City Council.

Several suggestions can be made to explain why the proposal by the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee to establish a permanent Cultural Committee was rejected by City Council. Philosophically, Edmonton Parks and Recreation saw the responsibility for cultural development as part of the recreation mandate and, therefore, as not to be separated from it. The setting up of a separate body to overlook cultural development would clearly limit the mandate of Edmonton Parks and Recreation in this matter. Politically, there was pressure from the provincial Minister of Culture to preserve the existing Parks and Recreation Advisory Board structure as the body to recommend the distribution of provincial Major Cultural/Recreational Facility Development Program (commonly known as MCR) grant monies. A letter from the Minister of Culture, Horst Schmidt to the Mayor of the City of

Edmonton, Ces Purves (February 21, 1979) revealed the following:

> In order to assure that such cultural growth continues in the future, I am sure you will agree that knowledgeable cultural representation is highly desirable on Community Recreation Board.
> ... Alberta Culture has been pleased to cooperate and work closely with Community Recreation Boards in Alberta to further the development of our cultural growth in the community.

Administratively, a permanent Cultural Committee was seen as a duplication of the existing Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. Therefore, the recommendation was made to City Council to initiate a bylaw amendment which would accommodate cultural representation on the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board.

In part, expansion to the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board from the original Parks and Recreation Advisory Board can be seen as a direct outcome of the development of the cultural policy for Edmonton. The Board's involvement with the cultural policy was seen by three interviewees as of vital importance. Yet, it remained merely consultative in its relation to the cultural policy process from 1979 (when three members were added to the Cultural Sub-committee) to 1984. Two reasons were suggested by two interviewees for this phenomenon. First, the addition of the cultural responsibility was not anticipated by the members of the original Advisory Board. Adjustment to culture took time as the original board members "did not know that we are coming." Second, the major workload of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board was to consider grant applications from community groups. As volunteers, the members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board had very little time left for tasks other than recommending grant allocations to City Council. However, the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board did have some involvement in the cultural policy process during the period in which dialogues and public hearings were conducted by Edmonton Parks and Recreation to consult with interest groups in an attempt to reflect their concerns. The Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board was invited to attend the public workshops and hearings held by Edmonton Parks and Recreation, and make comments on the policy drafts. The Board at that time seemed to be sympathetic to the concerns of the arts community and no major disagreement between them could be found.

During the year 1984, drafting of the cultural policy was delegated to the Mayor's Task Force On Culture, an independent body with no representation from the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. Participation from the Board in the cultural policy process during this period could not be traced. Three interviewees asserted that there was no consultation with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board while the Mayor's Task Force On Culture was preparing its policy proposal.

Self-initiated involvement of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board in the cultural policy was seen in 1984-85, after the Mayor's Task Force On Culture submitted its proposal for a cultural policy. The Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board took a stand actively opposing the proposal put forward by the Task Force. Specifically it opposed the proposal for a Cultural Commission, an independent, arms length body to be directly responsible for cultural grant-giving in the city.

Only limited communication could be traced in this brief period. It mainly consisted of internal communication among members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, and limited formal communication to the City Council, including the Mayor and Aldermen. There was also direct communication between the Chairperson of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, Cora Molstad, and the Chairperson of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture, Percy Wickman. The concerns of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board were voiced at the City Council meeting of November 1985, together with the concerns of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. Active participation of the members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board in the cultural policy resumed when City Council decided to establish an Implementation Committee, which included a representative from the Board, to oversee the details of implementing the cultural policy.

It is worth pointing out that the involvement of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board during 1984 and 1985 took on a dimension which resembled that of an interest group. As suggested by one interviewee, the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board members were dissatisfied with the proposal of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture because they thought they were doing "a reasonably good job" in giving out cultural grants on behalf

of the city (upon approval of City Council). The proposed removal of the authority to give cultural grants, and the reduction of jurisdiction to a parks and recreation advisory board, were seen as threats to the functioning of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board.

The greatest discrepancy between the documentary analysis and the interviews was found with respect to the involvement of government officials, other than the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. While the documentary analysis indicated the participation of four municipal government departments in the cultural policy process, relatively little was mentioned of the involvement of these government officials in the interviews. In fact, only one person, Alex Szechechina, the Grants Coordinator from the Finance Department, was named by one interviewee as being an active participant in the development of the policy. None of the interest group representatives mentioned any interaction with officials from government departments other than Edmonton Parks and Recreation. However, the existence of interaction between Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff and the staff of other government departments was confirmed by one interviewee. This may be a result of not interviewing officials from this category. Perhaps the form of municipal government can offer a more logical explanation of this discrepancy between the knowledge of the interest group representatives and the actual participation of the government officials.

From 1979 to 1982, the Commissioner of Public Affairs was directly involved in responding to the policy drafts prepared by Edmonton Parks and Recreation and in monitoring the progress of the cultural policy. Although the interest groups might not have been aware of it at the time, the communication and interaction between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and two government departments, namely the Board of Commissioners (Public Affairs) and the Department of Finance, were well recorded in Edmonton Parks and Recreation departmental documents.

Discussion between the General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, Hugh Monroe (who replaced V. Kondrosky), and the Commissioner of Public Affairs, A.H. Savage, centered on the contents of the policy paper, Cultural Arts Policy: Recommendations for Municipal Action. While Edmonton Parks and Recreation saw the paper as a departmental

policy paper ready to be submitted to City Council, the Commissioner had doubts about the feasibility of this draft as the basis for a City policy. No specific solution could be found from the communication. The writer of the study therefore concluded that the disagreement between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and the Board of Commissioners (Public Affairs) resulted in the demise of the draft policy before it reached higher levels of government.

When the form of municipal government of Edmonton was examined, the administrative and political relationship between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and the Commissioner of Public Affairs became obvious. Until 1984, Edmonton operated in the council-commission form of government (Masson 1985) where a professional management approach was adopted. Administrative and executive power was delegated to a Board of Commissioners composed of senior administrators. While the bureaucratic elites. in this case the senior staff members of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, informally initiated the policy proposal, the Commission Board was empowered with the administrative authority to make policy recommendations to City Council. In a sense, the Commission Board could be seen as the bridge between the administration, Edmonton Parks and Recreation and City Council in formulating policy. The pattern of elite accommodation could be seen from the document between the two elite groups that the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation were highly cooperative in making changes to the proposed policy upon the recommendations of the Commissioner of Public Affairs. However, since the commissioner also acted as the "gate-keeper" for policy proposals to be submitted to City Council, (Masson 1985, 37), the disagreement of the Commissioner of Public Affairs about the format and nature of the policy proposal by Edmonton Parks and Recreation might be the reason why the proposal never appeared on the agenda of City Council.

The council-commission form of government was criticized by Masson (1985, 37-38) as "overly complex, with almost infinite lines of political and administrative responsibility" that "provides for little citizen input into either the policy making or the administrative process." The complex administrative structure of the City at that time might have prevented the interest groups from participating in the process, as well as accounting for their lack of

knowledge of the attempted accommodation between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and the Commissioner of Public Affairs on the cultural policy proposal. As suggested by Lightbody (1983, 274), "upwardly mobile civic managers do not upset applecarts in Edmonton. Rarely do internal struggles over policy alternatives reach the public ear, even though some have been fierce." This seem to suggest that elite accommodation should not be regarded as a peaceful political process as struggle and conflict seem to be integral parts of the accommodation process.

The period 1984 and 1985 saw the involvement of the Department of Finance (specifically the Grants Coordinator) and the Office of the City Solicitor as consultants to the proposal put forward by the Mayor's Task Force On Culture. The involvement of these two departments was important in the sense that the proposal prepared by the Mayor's Task Force On Culture pointed to possible changes in the legal (establishing an arms length Cultural Commission) and financial (funding through the municipal tax base) structures of the municipal government. The importance of the role played by these two departments could have been overlooked by interest group representatives since the departments only played a consulting function, never one of negotiation.

Edmonton Parks and Recreation provided the longest time of involvement and the largest group of actors from a single organization to the development of the cultural policy for Edmonton. Research through documents and interviews also suggested that the role of Edmonton Parks and Recreation went through several changes in the course of its history. This section will concentrate on discussing the impact of the involvement of Edmonton Parks and Recreation in the policy process, through its attempts to make it an administrative policy.

Although the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee was assigned the task of preparing the proposal in 1978, it can be observed from its minutes that the representative from Edmonton Parks and Recreation, George Earle, was the writer of the first draft of the proposal. The efforts at collecting relevant materials and the experience of actually attempting to write a cultural policy continued in Edmonton Parks and Recreation in the following years and resulted in a few different drafts of the policy. Also, Edmonton Parks and Recreation

was directly involved in commenting upon the feasibility of the Ad Hoc Committee report. This function of Edmonton Parks and Recreation as a point of reference for cultural policy proposals was maintained throughout the course of the development of the cultural policy for the City. An interviewee expressed the opinion that the involvement of Edmonton Parks and Recreation in the cultural policy for Edmonton provided the opportunity for the department to accumulate knowledge of both the cultural sector and the problems faced by the community groups involved. The department was then able to act as a moderator for the interest groups involved, in 1985 and 1986, in redrafting the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board bylaw.

Besides cooperating with the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee in drafting a policy in 1978, active participation of Edmonton Parks and Recreation was also evident in the period from 1979 to 1981 when the Department approached it from the angle of a departmental administrative report. A study Cultural Arts Policy: Recommendations for Municipal Action was completed to provide developmental and operational guidelines in the area of cultural activities, facilities and services. The final study was the last of a series of six papers prepared by Donna Davies, the Cultural Planner.

The communication patterns, until late 1981, were mainly limited to communication among Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff and communication between Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff and the Commissioner of Public Affairs.

As far as internal communication is concerned, the background papers prepared by the Cultural Planner were sent to District Recreation Coordinators and supervisors for input and comments. Direct correspondence between Donna Davies and the district staff resulted in certain changes to the background papers; but the philosophical framework remained unchanged. The effort to present a balanced proposal seemed to be an important part of the internal discussion. It was mentioned by one interviewee that "through their work experience or education, {the staff members might} have a particular emphasis, normally in one discipline or another." Another interviewee echoed the same point by saying that there seemed to be more of an understanding towards amateur arts rather than professional arts in the

Department. It was then suggested that a lot of effort was spent to maintain a balance among the different points of view within the Department.

At a higher administrative level, the same papers were sent to the Commissioner of Public Affairs, A.H. Savage, for scrutiny as an attempt by the executives of Edmonton Parks and Recreation to urge the city to adopt the proposal as a municipal policy. Discussions between the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation and the Commissioner of Public Affairs concentrated mainly on the feasibility of adopting the proposal. Discussion included the issues of the duties and responsibilities of Edmonton Parks and Recreation in the delivery of cultural services, budgetary estimation and the format in which the document should be written in order to become a City policy.

The involvement of Edmonton Parks and Recreation staff and its impact until 1981 can be observed. From the administrative point of view, dialogue between the staff members of Edmonton Parks and Recreation had two distinct implications. The six background papers and the recommendations within then resulted in an organizational change within Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Until 1981, the human resources to provide cultural programs and services were scattered in different parts of the department. The recommendations made in the proposal resulted in the setting up of a Special Services Unit, with three staff and a special events coordinator, to deal with the provision of cultural services.

Beyond that, the process of arriving at the final recommendations was also significant in terms of sharpening the awareness of Parks and Recreation staff regarding the issues involved in cultural programming. From the communication between district recreation staff and the Cultural Planner, a few prominent issues were observed. Firstly, the issue of art and ethnic activities was given a lot of attention within the reports. Suggestions were made to change the proposal from a cultural policy to an arts policy in order to avoid confusion. However, this did not materialize since the departmental direction to develop a cultural policy had to be followed. However, the following definition of "cultural arts" seemed to suggest a compromise as a result of the discussions to include ethnoculturalism in the scope of the policy proposal. As stated in the Cultural Arts Policy: Recommendations for Municipal

Action (Edmonton Parks and Recreation 1980, 1):

> The cultural arts include the expressive art form of music, drama, dance, visual arts, literature and crafts. Included are artistic expressions from the past as well as those of Edmonton's ethnic constituents.

The other issue dealt with was the difference in opinion between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and the Commissioner of Public Affairs regarding the nature of the policy proposal. Correspondence between the General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, Hugh Monroe, and Commissioner A.H. Savage seem to suggest that while members of the Department saw the policy as a departmental one, the Commissioner saw it as a potential municipal policy which required vigorous scrutiny, especially in terms of its financial implications for the City. This difference did not seem to have been resolved to any satisfactory extent and the policy proposal was not presented to City Council. This marked the end of this phase of Edmonton Parks and Recreation's involvement, as well as the period where Edmonton Parks and Recreation was solely responsible for the drafting of a cultural policy.

To sum up, until 1981, attempts at elite accommodation had taken place within the civic government without the involvement of interest groups. The important feature in this type of elite accommodation is that it took place within the City's administrative structure. As Edmonton Parks and Recreation was subordinate to the Board of Commissioners, the approval of the cultural policy proposal by the Commissioner of Public Affairs was essential. Therefore, the pattern of accommodation was observed to be of one direction only (Edmonton Parks and Recreation trying to incorporate the comments of the Commissioner of Public Affairs).

## Chapter V

## ELITE ACCOMMODATION AND INTEREST GROUP INTERACTION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CULTURAL POLICY FOR THE CITY OF EDMONTON

Interest group activities will be the major focus of discussion in this chapter and these will be discussed in two sections. The first section will assess the origins, structures and evolution of the interest groups involved. Then the patterns of elite interaction will be explored through the demonstrated relationships between interest groups and their governmental targets. The basic aim is to compare the theoretical framework of the theory of elite accommodation with the actual events in the cultural policy process.

### A. Interest Groups: Origin, Structure, and Evolution

Seven major interest groups were found to be active in the cultural policy process. The first two groups, the Edmonton Visual Arts Committee and the Edmonton Arts Alliance, were formed in 1982 as a result of the public workshops hosted by Edmonton Parks and Recreation. The third group, the Edmonton Committee on Multiculturalism, formed around the same period, had close ties with the Alberta Heritage Council, as active members tended to belong to both organizations. The fourth group, the Mayor's Task Force On Culture, was a body that included representatives from the above three groups. It differed from the rest of the interest groups in that it was set up by the Mayor (Laurence Decore) and reported directly to him through the Chairman of the Task Force (Alderman Percy Wickman). The Edmonton Professional Arts Council and the Edmonton Cultural Caucus were formed in 1985 to react to the proposal put forward by the Mayor's Task Force On Culture. The Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues was also involved from 1985 on.

The involvement of private organizations in the cultural policy process was not limited entirely to the above seven groups. However, other organizations played only a minor role in terms of individual input into the policy process, mostly in July and August 1983, when the public was requested by the Public Affairs Committee to comment on the paper Towards an Arts Policy. Almost all of the organizations that had submitted briefs to the Public Affairs

Committee were affiliated with either the Edmonton Arts Alliance, the Edmonton Visual Arts Committee, or the Edmonton Committee on Multiculturalism. This seemed to suggest that interest group activities in and around 1983 were concentrated in the three groups mentioned above.

Several common characteristics of the origins of the interest groups were evident. Of the seven major groups, five were formed as ad hoc committees. One implication of this finding is that very little could be discussed about the internal philosophy and workings of these committees, especially given the lack of written documents that clearly defined the groups and the varying degree of involvement of their members. However, through the two separate position papers submitted by the Edmonton Arts Alliance and the Edmonton Visual Arts Committee, as well as through the general recall and assessment of the interviewees, the purpose of these ad hoc committees was made clear. Five interest groups seemed to be issue oriented. The common element that bounded their members together was the controversy created by the various cultural policy papers. The other two groups, the Mayor's Task Force On Culture and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, differed drastically from the rest in their origins. At first, the Mayor's Task Force On Culture seemed to be an unexpected development within the framework of elite accommodation. Established mainly as a result of a single individual's power and influence, namely Mayor Laurence Decore (after a discussion with Krishan Joshee in the ethnocultural community), the Task Force was formed with the underlying principle that accommodation would be achieved by means of collective group interaction. It may differed from the rest of the groups in terms of its origin, the functions they served remained similar. The Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, established in 1921 as an umbrella organization for the community leagues (originally a collection of ratepayer associations active in making demands on City Council), has had a long history of involvement in both recreation and city policy making.

In addition to the differences of origin, differences of membership base should also be discussed. Generally, two types of membership composition could be found in the interest groups. Six of them shared what was described by Masson (1985) as a "narrow based"

membership, with members sharing the same profession or ethnic concerns. The memberships of organizations such as the Edmonton Visual Arts Committee, the Edmonton Arts Alliance, and the Edmonton Professional Arts Council were made up of professional and semi-professional artists, arts administrators, consultants and educators. The Edmonton Committee on Multiculturalism consisted of people active in promoting ethnic causes in both Edmonton and Alberta (through ties with the Alberta Heritage Council). Membership on the Mayor's Task Force On Culture was basically taken from the interest groups of 1983, namely the arts community and the ethnocultural community. In contrast, the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues has a "broadly based" membership from the community grassroots. However, membership in individual community leagues' was largely determined by the residential locations of the members. All interest groups members were volunteers.

The structure of all the interest groups can be classified as "local-only". The dominant feature of local-only organizations as being social-recreational and welfare types of organizations, suggested by Presthus, was applicable to the interest groups in this case. For example, community leagues are generally regarded as neighbourhood associations with a strong recreational and social overtone. Although the general issue involved in the conflicts over the cultural policy for Edmonton, especially after 1982, had to do with demands for more and more equitable funding to the areas represented by the interest groups, the groups seemed to vary in their needs for such funding increases. The main objective of the professional arts community was to demand recognition from City Council of the status of professional artists and their importance to the city both economically and politically. A person who had been working with the professional arts community went on to suggest that what the arts community wanted in 1982 was something similar to a welfare system to subsidize low income artists. The objective of the ethnocultural groups at the same time was, as one person commented, "to be treated more like a community league". The issue of property tax on ethnocultural centres was the main problem faced by the ethnic groups in the city. Furthermore, the problems faced by the ethnic groups were mostly social problems, such as integration into Canadian society, access to social services, human rights, race relations and

problems in dealing with the police. It was agreed by all of the interviewees, when commenting on the participation of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues in the cultural policy process, that the Federation had no specific objective in the development of a cultural policy other than a view conflicting with the ethnic groups as to how the community should be run. The fear of losing both funding and membership in the community leagues to the arts and ethnic groups seemed to be the only reason for its participation. As one person suggested, "if it had been left to the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, I'm sure they wouldn't be pushing for any cultural policy at all."

Since most of the interest groups originated as ad hoc committees, it is important to trace their evolution in relation to the cultural policy process. Three phases of evolution were estimated in the life of the interest groups. The first phase involved mainly organizations which represented smaller and weaker groups in the policy process. The second is generally known as the "reluctant marriage" between the arts and ethnocultural communities. The last phase involved interest groups that were established (or "flagship") organizations, such as the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues.

The Edmonton Visual Arts Committee, the Edmonton Arts Alliance and the Edmonton Committee on Multiculturalism shared the common property of representing the smaller and often weaker organizations in the city. Within the arts community, the visual and literary artists were among the most powerless. One individual suggested in the interview that individuals such as sculptors and writers were not getting enough attention in the funding process administered through the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board because the advisory board tended to give out grants to groups rather than individuals. As for the ethnic groups, their power base was not in the municipal area, as most of their support came from the provincial government through Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism. Although they had been successful in obtaining capital grants from both the city and the provincial government to build cultural centres, they still had to deal with the issue of paying high commercial property tax to the city.

Participation from the three interest groups was extremely active during the 1982-83 period but very little actual progress was made in terms of developing a cultural policy. The effort of the arts community to formulate an arts policy in cooperation with some members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board only resulted in violent objection from the ethnic community. The marriage between the arts and ethnic communities in the form of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture was identified by all the interviewees as the result of Decore's intervention. The interviewees saw it mainly as a move of political expediency rather than a solution to deal with the differences between the arts and the ethnocultural groups. (This important shift of policy direction will be further discussed in the next section.) As far as the interest groups were concerned, the establishment of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture seemed to have dissolved the three interest groups by taking over their tasks as well as their leaders.

Two major principles, the arms length body and funding based on the City's tax base, proposed by the Mayor's Task Force On Culture in late 1984 received wide discussion among the interest groups in the city. On the surface, it seemed that the arts and the ethnic communities were once again involved in voicing their concerns. Membership within the professional arts community had, however, changed from that of small and less established groups to that of the established flagship organizations. Furthermore, the interest groups involved in the cultural policy process seemed to share the same motive of self-preservation. The Edmonton Professional Arts Council, originally known as the Edmonton Professional Arts Caucus, consisted originally of the five "flagship" organizations of the arts.[5] An interviewee suggested that, the Chairman of Edmonton Professional Arts Council, Peter Carter, disagreed with the proposal of the Task Force because it did not include funding details and guidelines. He also expressed disagreement to working jointly with the ethnocultural groups. Two interviewees also held the opinion that the Edmonton Professional Arts Council was successful in the negotiation of the cultural policy in two ways. One was that none of the privileges enjoyed by the flagship arts organizations were affected by the

[5]These organizations were The Alberta Ballet, The Edmonton Symphony, The Edmonton Opera Association, The Citadel Theatre and the Edmonton Art Gallery.

change of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board bylaw. The other was that the Edmonton Professional Arts Council had since its beginning grown stronger and more stable as the official interest group for the artistic community. The involvement of the Edmonton Professional Arts Council also prompted the formation of the Edmonton Cultural Caucus--simply as a different form of the Edmonton Committee on Multiculturalism and the ethnic component of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture--to balance the voice of the professional arts community.

The general consensus of the interviewees was that self-preservation motivated the participation of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. It was also clear from the minutes of the meetings of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues that its fear of losing both power and funding prompted its opposition to the Task Force proposal to City Council. The most important aspect about the involvement of interest groups from 1985 on was not only that of easy entry into the debate but also the relative ease with which their input was reflected in subsequent drafts of the cultural policy proposal.

**B. Patterns of Elite Interaction and Accommodation**

Patterns of interaction and accommodation will be discussed in four directions: interest groups with bureaucrats; interest groups with appointed elites; interest groups with legislators; and interest groups with one another. The political effectiveness of the interest groups will be discussed in relation to these patterns of interaction.

**Interest Groups and Bureaucrats**

Interaction between interest group representatives and government bureaucrats can be discussed in terms of its general and specific patterns.

In general, interest groups seemed to have maintained a consistent line of interaction with the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. All of the interest group representatives reported having held discussions with this important segment of the bureaucratic elite. However, the major form of interaction seemed to have been limited to formal lines of

communication, such as public hearings and workshops and through paper writing.

Four factors seemed to have influenced the patterns of interaction between interest group representatives and bureaucratic elites. Firstly, the staff of the department of Parks and Recreation seemed to be guided by a philosophical preference for public participation. It was evident, as early as 1978, that Edmonton Parks and Recreation was interested in engaging the public in the cultural policy process, only to be turned down by the Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee. The importance of involving the public was echoed in 1981 when the department attempted to gather input from the public on a cultural policy draft. Secondly, the client-civil servant principle between the interest groups and Edmonton Parks and Recreation seems to have encouraged easy access of interest groups to the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Records have shown that meetings between the two groups were a major part of the Edmonton Parks and Recreation involvement in the cultural policy process. Three major public workshops were held in 1983 alone. Thirdly, interaction seemed to be mostly based on written documents. None of the interest group representatives had indicated any form of informal interaction with the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. The extent of informal interaction between the interest groups and Edmonton Parks and Recreation is, in fact, unknown. However, interest groups that had submitted written position papers seemed to have sustained a more consistent line of communication with Edmonton Parks and Recreation than those who did not. Lastly, interaction between the two elite groups seemed to be single-issue oriented, with the pattern being that Edmonton Parks and Recreation asked for comments and recommendations from interest groups, and interest groups expressed their ideal version of the cultural policy to Edmonton Parks and Recreation.

Specific patterns of interaction between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and interest groups seemed to vary throughout the course of development of the cultural policy for Edmonton. This variation seemed to be influenced by a change from a client-civil servant relationship to that of a interest groups-mediator relationship. Earlier interaction between the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation and interest groups suggested that of a one-to-one relationship with the interest groups as clients of the department. Among the interest groups,

the arts community seemed to have stronger linkages with the department through documents and papers. Also, the department had a longer history of dealing with the arts community through the administration of amateur and recreational arts programs directed mainly towards youth and children. This may explain the easily established communication between the two elites.

Ethnic groups seemed to be less involved in the interactions with Edmonton Parks and Recreation. As mentioned by one interviewee, unlike the arts community, the ethnocultural community tended to prefer informal interaction and communication by word of mouth. Therefore, the preferred line of communication within Edmonton Parks and Recreation might have been less appealing to the ethnocultural groups despite the consideration given by the department to ethnic group input into the policy process. Beyond that, the ethnic groups seemed to prefer and value more interactions with legislators, such as City Council members. This may account for the limited interaction between the ethnic groups and the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation.

Interaction between interest groups and Edmonton Parks and Recreation changed to that of interest groups-mediator in 1985 when Edmonton Parks and Recreation was called on to translate interest group demands into recommendations for bylaw changes regarding the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. None of the interest groups expressed any significance about their interaction with the department during this period. Perhaps, the pattern of interaction between interest groups and the department became more diffuse as the departmental responsibility changed from a direct to a facilitative one, i.e., the move from drafting the policy itself to assisting the stakeholders to draft the policy. As well, the focus of the meetings was on the interest group dynamics in arriving at an agreeable solution to the bylaw changes. The interest groups might not have seen the role of Edmonton Parks and Recreation as important when compared to that of the interest groups themselves.

**Interest Groups and Legislators**

Interest groups interactions with legislators were found to have taken place much less consistently than their interactions with bureaucrats. However, the importance of interactions between interest groups and legislators was confirmed from both positive and negative experiences. Both the ethnic groups and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues reported interaction with City Council members while the arts community indicated little communication with the legislators.

Generally, an asymmetrical process was found with interest groups seeking access to City Council members. A representative from the ethnic community revealed that many visits had been made to Aldermen's offices to solicit support for the ethnic groups' concerns about the cultural policy and reported that many of the Aldermen were not aware of the policy papers that were being circulated. It was admitted by this representative that the process of soliciting support from the city Aldermen was difficult, although there had been some success in gaining the support of some Aldermen.

However, when interaction was initiated by the legislators, the result of such interaction seems to be more dynamic and dramatic. Two examples were found to illuminate this point. The first case was in 1984, when Laurence Decore initiated the process of combining the arts and ethnocultural communities in one body to prepare a cultural policy. His incentive for such action was agreed by all interviewees to be political, with the potential voting power of the ethnic community as the perceived political return. Since the mayoralty campaign of Laurence Decore had rested heavily on ethnic support, the move by Decore to try to benefit the ethnic groups was regarded by most interviewees as bestowing political favours.

The other case of accommodation between legislators and interest groups was seen when Alderman Ron Hayter strongly opposed the proposal submitted by the Mayor's Task Force On Culture, and provided information and support to the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues in its opposition to the proposal. The Federation was not aware of the work of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture until an announcement on the radio was made.

The impact of the involvement of the Federation was felt almost immediately when it succeeded in placing a representative in the Implementation Committee with the aid of Alderman Hayter who put forward motions in Council to involve the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues in the process, as well as writing to the local newspaper objecting to the Task Force proposal. The incentive behind this action could be seen as a combination of (1) seeking the potential voting power of the membership in the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues and, (2) recognition of its long history of being a legitimate citizen organization in the city.

The lack of interaction between legislators and interest groups was seen by two interviewees as having a negative effect on the political effectiveness of the arts community. One person commented that when the arts community was active in demanding an arts policy in 1983, it made the mistake of going "the bureaucratic route". As no move was made to convince the politicans of the value of the arts community to the city, demands were not realized at the higher level. Another person commented that, even in the present City Council, none of the Aldermen were either knowledgeable of, or sympathetic to, the arts community. The interviewee felt that this lack of support from the City Council to the arts community had made the development of a cultural policy extremely difficult.

**Interest Groups and Appointed Elites**

Interaction between interest groups and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board (appointed elites) was consistent in the sense that discussion of the cultural policy had involved the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board as a matter of fact (except in the case of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture). Most often, however, the interaction between interests groups and the members of the Board was limited to funding applications. Past members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board admitted that the workload of making grant recommendations to City Council had taken up virtually all of the meeting time of the Board.

Two observations can be made about the interaction between interest groups and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. One concerns the general information-gathering function of the Board. The other deals with the shifts of relationships between interest groups and the Board.

Through funding applications, the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board was provided with information about the activities conducted by the community groups. (Its legitimate position as a group of experts in the area of recreation might have helped it to regain entrance into the cultural policy process in 1985). The relationships between the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board and interest groups seemed to have shifted, depending on the affiliation and preference of the Board Chairperson in about 1984. Two points can be raised to support this observation. In the first instance, ethnic groups had been active in applying for government grants through the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. However, the principle of "grant by merit" (meaning "artistic merit") seemed to be the dominant principle in the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board in considering grant applications. A past Board member pointed out that ethnic groups were not always successful in their grant applications because they had shown no artistic merits, and the board was reluctant to give out grants on the grounds of ethnicity. An ethnic group representative, on the other hand, felt that dealing with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board had been frustrating because grant applications from ethnic groups were given low priority and the grant money was gone before their applications were considered. This difference in opinion regarding the criteria for grant giving might have accelerated the action taken by ethnic groups to make demands on the cultural policy as potential advantages might be gained by ethnic groups if the cultural policy recognize the principle of "merit by ethnicity". The second point can be highlighted by a case which occurred in 1984-85 when the chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board was also an active member of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. Representation from community leagues on the Board was found to be much stronger and more vocal when compared to previous times. Although it is not conclusive as to the actual influence of the Board chairman on the cultural policy

direction, an information network that favoured the communication between the Advisory Board and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues could have been established due to closer personal ties.

**Interaction Among Interest Groups**

No evidence could be found within the documents and interviews regarding self-initiated informal interaction among the interest groups. Representatives reported that informal interaction mainly consisted of talking to people in the same community about the issues involved in the cultural policy. Furthermore, formal interaction among the interest groups seemed to fall into one of the following two patterns: arranged interaction or confrontation.

Arranged interaction was mainly the result of the creation of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture. The arts and ethnocultural components basically worked independently and met to put the policy document together. Although the picture of an "unwilling marriage" was painted by the local media, interviews with the members involved in the Task Force seemed to contradict this characterization. One person mentioned that working with the ethnocultural component of the Task Force "wasn't that horrendous" and that it had provided her with the opportunity to understand the problems faced by the ethnic groups. Perhaps the perceived political gain shared by the two groups may be the reason why they worked in relative harmony with each other. Neither of the two groups was political powerful enough alone to push forward the cultural policy through City Council. The political advantage of having the support of the Mayor might have been the only solution to the problem.

The pattern of confrontation (and the frustration of the actors involved in the process) was evident in this study. As a matter of fact, interviewees who had worked as interest group representatives spent a lot of their interview time revealing their frustrations with the policy process and the problems of working with other groups. To understand the reasons behind these emotions is the aim of this section.

Among the three interest groups, conflict of interest was found only between the ethnic groups and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. Two similarities between the two groups were pointed out by several interviewees as being the cause of their conflicts. In the first instance, both were voluntary, community-based grassroots organizations. Both were also umbrella organizations of subordinate groups. Their similarity in organizational structure might have been the cause for their conflicts in the cultural policy, in that they were in direct competition for their membership bases. Three individuals expressed the opinion that perhaps the gaining of political momentum through the political activism of the ethnic groups was a sign of weakness in the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. They went on the suggest that the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues might have became complacent in its success and have neglected certain needs in the community in more recent years (when immigrant numbers increased). The Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues and its supporters objected to the Task Force Proposal on the grounds that more concessions granted to the ethnic community might cause division within the community. However, it seems that the increase in the membership base of the ethnic community might have been perceived to have a negative effect on the membership (and the related power base) of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues.

The other phenomenon co nmon to the two groups was that both groups were mostly concerned with the issue of facilities. Support given by the City of Edmonton to the arts community was mainly that of property tax waiver and lease subsidies. Recreation facilities which belonged to the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues were also exempted from property tax. Competition for such privileges by ethnic groups was evident in the study. The theory of elite accommodation which assumes a limited supply of resources may be used to explain the conflict of the two groups. When the two were seeking the same limited resources (such as municipal tax waiver and membership), conflict would occur if they perceive themselves to be involved in a zero sum game situation.

The conflict between the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues and ethnic groups might also help to explain the resentment expressed towards the Federation by

individuals involved in the arts. Basically, the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues only targeted its criticism towards the ethnic groups. It was also admitted by an interviewee that involvement of the community leagues in the arts was only at an amateur programming level. The professional arts community had very different concerns in the cultural policy and they saw the involvement of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues as interference in what they had accomplished. Therefore, interviewees from the arts community were still in favour of the idea of a separate arts policy which would provide them with autonomy or reduce the control exerted by the city administration.

**C. Political Effectiveness of Interest Groups**

Three empirical criteria were used by Presthus in crossnational studies to evaluate the effectiveness of interest groups. The first criterion dealt with political activism (defined as the frequency of interaction between interest groups and governmental targets). The second consisted of the subjective judgements of the political elites on group effectiveness. The third one was the judgement of interest group elites themselves concerning the utility of their lobbying efforts (Presthus 1973, 206-208).

In this study, only one of the three criteria suggested could be applied to explore the effectiveness of interest groups. The subjective judgement of political elites with respect to the interest group effectiveness could not be solicited, as none of the political elites approached for interview was available. Consideration was given to the use of frequency of interaction between interest groups and governmental targets but this was abandoned because of the likelihood that group interaction with bureaucratic elites would be more likely to be recorded than other lines of interaction since the bureaucratic elites had the responsibility to communicate with their clients. However, the subjective judgement of the interest groups representatives themselves revealed some interesting points regarding the utility of their lobbying efforts.

Both the documentary search and the reports of the interviewees indicated that all of the interest groups saw themselves as being at least partially effective in their lobbying efforts.

Two factors seem to have been used by interest group representatives when judging their own effectiveness. One focussed upon their evaluations of their communication vis-à-vis bureaucratic and political elites. The other had to do with whether they saw their demands as being satisfied in the final solution to the cultural policy proposal (i.e., was there equal representation in the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board by all three types of interest groups).

The findings indicated that most interaction took place between the staff of Edmonton Parks and Recreation (bureaucratic elites) and interest groups, particularly the arts community, while the interaction between interest groups and City Council members (legislative elites) was only sporadic. There was also very little, if any, interaction among the interest groups themselves other than in public meetings. The exception was in 1984 when the Mayor's Task Force On Culture was drafting the cultural policy. Interaction, mostly confrontational in nature, also took place in 1985-86 when the interest groups were re-drafting the cultural policy to prepare for bylaw changes concerning the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board.

The general evaluation of the interest group leaders seemed to suggest that the legislative elites were identified as the key to interest group lobbying efforts. They all regarded the City Council members as the ultimate decision makers for any issue within the jurisdiction of the City Council and felt that the sympathies of the Aldermen and the Mayor for their causes was the key to their success in lobbying. Relating this point to the historical development of the cultural policy, some observations can be made. The arts community was the first to be involved in the cultural policy process as an interest group, and its communication was mainly with the bureaucratic elites within Edmonton Parks and Recreation. One interviewee from the arts community commented about the lack of accomplishment with the cultural policy despite the intense effort of the arts community:

> There have to be sympathetic bureaucrats in the city. No doubt about it. The reality is if you haven't convinced the politicans, or at least the majority, {that} you have the product, or {that} whatever you have is valid, then it really doesn't matter what happens with the bureaucrats. You have to have both on your side. You have to convince the politicans {that} what you are doing is valid and that there is a need for a policy.

The lobbying efforts of the ethnocultural group toward City Council members were identified as an important part of its lobbying tactics. Although it was admitted that the effects were slow to develop, as many aldermen were often unaware of the position papers and proposals being circulated, the interviewee from the ethnocultural group admitted that it did gather support from some Aldermen for its causes at the end. The case of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, however, can be best used to illustrate the importance of aldermanic support to a group's lobbying efforts. The Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues seemed to differ from the ethnocultural community in its lobbying success with the City Council members in that there was support from within the City Council to raise the concerns of the Federation in the form of motions at Council Meetings, as well as in getting the attention of the media.

To summarize, there appeared to be a shift of emphasis away from lobbying of the bureaucratic elites to lobbying of the legislative elites throughout the course of the development of the cultural policy. The factor that influenced the success of the interest groups' lobbying efforts seemed to be their access to, and support from, City Council members. The success of an interest group's lobbying efforts seemed to be related also to the perceived powerfulness of the interest group on the part of the political elites. Although no direct interview with the political elites was conducted, the argument in favor of the inclusion of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues in the policy process appeared to rest heavily on the size of its membership and its long standing history as a politically active group in the city. To a lesser extent, the potential political power of the ethnic community seemed to have played an important part in motivating the Mayor to strike a Task Force to secure its position in the cultural policy which resulted in its getting equal representation with the other interest groups in the new Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board.

## Chapter VI

## Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

### A. Summary

This study examined the theoretical framework of elite accommodation and its related theory of interaction and determined whether or not they were applicable to, and capable of, explaining the evolution of the cultural policy for Edmonton.

Data collection was conducted in two phases. The document search located written documents relevant to the policy process. The chain of events and the identities of significant actors in them were determined at the end of this phase. Then, focussed interviews were employed to explore the subjective experiences of representatives of all of the major groups of actors regarding the policy process.

The findings of the study can be summarized as follows:

1. Fifty-six individuals were found to be significant actors in the policy process;
2. Based on the roles that they played in the policy process, they were categorized into four elite groups, of which three were described in the theory of elite accommodation (the bureaucratic, private and legislative elites);
3. The fourth group (appointed elites) had not been previously included within the boundary of the discussions of elite accommodation. It functioned generally as a special body created by the municipal government to handle issues that were deemed as politically too delicate to be handled by the municipal government;
4. The distribution of the significant actors among these four groups were twenty-two bureaucratic elites, sixteen private elites, nine legislative elites, and nine appointed elites.
5. The three major interest groups identified in this case were, in order of appearance, the arts community, the ethnocultural community, and the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues;
6. Elite accommodation seemed to be ineffective when one elite group held the power to veto a decision. For example, the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues was able

to veto the decision to establish a Cultural Commission (based on the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture) by withdrawing its participation in the cultural policy Implementation Committee in 1985;

7. Legislative elites were found to be important in the process of elite accommodation when compared to the bureaucratic elites. That is, those interest groups which received the support of the legislative elites seemed to be more successful in their lobbying efforts; and
8. The perceived political power of the interest groups might have played a part in the success of the more established groups in lobbying to the government.

**B. Theoretical Conclusions and Recommendations**

It can be concluded that the theory of elite accommodation was applicable to, and capable of explaining, the evolution of the cultural policy for Edmonton to a considerable extent. The policy process seemed to have moved from accommodation among bureaucratic elites to the more complex patterns of accommodation among governmental elites and interest group leaders. It also seems that the interaction and accommodation aimed at by all groups involved led eventually to the slowing down of the policy process, as the policy was basically rewritten with the inclusion of each new group of participants, as a form of accommodation. Therefore, it is important to suggest that, although the theory of elite accommodation seemed to be at work in the study, it might not be the most preferable method of negotiation, as communication tended to be less efficient and less effective when a large number of groups were involved.

Two basic factors seemed to be present in the policy process that favoured elite accommodation. The first was the nature of the policy, which did not require any qualifications for participation for the key actors (i.e., a person did not need technical skills or knowledge to be involved). In order to accommodate the increasing numbers of stakeholders and their input into the policy, a method of consultation and negotiation was employed. Second, despite their apparent differences in political influence, none of the interest groups was politically strong enough to push the cultural policy exclusively in any one

desired direction. An elaborate system of bargaining was eventually set up containing checks and balances of power, with the unspoken understanding that each stakeholder would get something rather than nothing.

The role of the appointed elites (in the form of an Advisory Board) was found to be an important feature in this case. It acted not only as a special body of experts to serve the cultural sector in the City but also as a body that City Council referred to often for input in cultural decisions. The findings also suggested that its position had actually changed from an appointed body to an interest group when it was opposed to the establishment of a Cultural Commission recommended by the Mayor's Task Force On Culture. The theory of elite accommodation has little to say about the presence of this type of special body in the policy process. Perhaps further research into the process of elite accommodation can be directed towards investigating the structures of Advisory Boards and the outcomes of their interaction with other elite groups in the policy process.

It can be speculated that the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues was more successful in having its demands met in the cultural policy process. Its relative effectiveness in lobbying can be observed in that it managed to change the policy direction at a much later stage of the process, despite the opposition of the two other interest groups. The ability of the Federation to veto a decision simply by withdrawing its participation from the negotiation is worth further investigation. This phenomenon raised the interesting observation that the perception of powerfulness of a certain elite may prompt other elites to act according to this perception. Therefore, future research linking the perception of power and lobbying effectiveness may be useful.

Although the time limit for this study was October 1986, the cultural policy process is ongoing in nature. Most interviewees agreed that a cultural policy for Edmonton is still being developed. One interviewee suggested that as the content of the cultural policy seemed to have moved from strictly the arts to that of a social policy. It is recommended, therefore, that the development of the cultural policy be analysed again in five years time to compare the major interest groups involved at that time.

**C. Methodological Conclusions and Recommendations**

It can be concluded that the combination of documentary analysis and focussed interviews was appropriate in answering the research questions posed. However, a few criticisms can be made regarding the research plan in the study and recommendations developed for further research.

The decision not to interview bureaucratic elites in civic departments other than Edmonton Parks and Recreation might have resulted in a relatively limited understanding of the roles played by this group of elites in the policy process. The documents showed some evidence that there was disagreement within the civic government, especially between Edmonton Parks and Recreation and the Finance Department in 1982 regarding the activities of the interest groups. While Edmonton Parks and Recreation seemed to be receptive to the idea of including interest groups in the policy process, the Finance Department held the opposite point of view. Perhaps the roles and relationships between municipal government departments could have been explored in more detail through focussed interviews.

The study concentrated principally on the actors involved in the policy process. As it showed, the evolution of the cultural policy for Edmonton resulted in more than ten major versions of policy proposals. The scope of the study was limited to an examination of the major principles in the proposals. It is recommended that content analysis be used to examine the details of the proposals and to discover if the items proposed throughout the course of their development underwent significant change.

**D. Practical Implications of the Study**

When the structures of the interest groups involved were compared, it became apparent that the more established and stable organizations were more effective in their lobbying efforts. Two implications might be considered. First, further investigation into how to strengthen single-issue oriented interest groups might help smaller and less established groups in raising their concerns more effectively. Second, one group, namely the Edmonton Professional Arts Council had evolved in the process from a single-issue oriented organization

to being an umbrella lobbying organization for the arts community. Its evolution might be useful to scholars interested in the development and maturity of voluntary organizations and the function they serve to their clients and acting on behalf of their clients in lobbying to government targets.

The study showed that interest groups were more effective when they have the support of City Council members. This may have practical implication on interest group representatives in communicating with their governmental counterparts. It seems that different functions are served by the bureaucratic elites and the legislative elites. While the bureaucratic elites can offer interest groups information on particular issues, interest group can possibly gain more political advantages by lobbying the legislative elites. Perhaps more time could be spent by interest groups in building working relationships with the City politicians.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Articles


Bhuyan, Sayefulah M. "The Pluralist Model: A Critical Analysis." Indian Political Science Review 17 (1983): 1-10.

Burton, Michael G. "Elites and Collective Protest." Sociological Quarterly 25 (1984): 45-65.

Cannon, Gordon E. "Consociationalism Vs. Control: Canada as a Casestudy." Western Political Quarterly 35 (1982): 50-64.

Clark, Terry N. "Power and Community Structure: Who Governs, Where and When?" The Sociological Quarterly 8 (1967): 291-316.

--------. "Can You Cut A Budget Pie?" Policy and Politics 3 (1974): 3-31.

Dahl, Robert A. "The Concept of Power." Behavioral Science 2 (1957): 201-215.

--------. "A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model." American Political Science Review 52 (1958): 463-469.

Easton, David. "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems." World Politics 9 (1957): 383-400.

Forcese, Dennis. "Elitists and Pluralists: Power in Canada." In Approaches to Canadian Politics, 2d ed., ed. John H. Redekop, 292-312. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc., 1983.

Freeman, L., et. al. "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of some Alternative Approaches." American Sociological Review 28 (1963): 791-798.

Gitelman, Zvi and David Naveh. "Elite Accommodation and Organizational Effectiveness: The Case of Immigrant Absorption in Israel." The Journal of Politics 38 (1976): 963-986.

Kadushin, Charles. "Power, Influence and Social Circles: A New Methodology for Studying Opinion Makers." American Sociological Review 33 (1968): 685-699.

Langub, Jayl. "Rural Development in Ba Kelalan, Saranak, Malaysia: Interaction Between Government and Community." Ph. D. diss., University of Alberta, 1983.

Lightbody, James. "Edmonton: Gateway to the North." In City Politics in Canada, ed. Warren Magnusson and James D. Anderson, 225-290. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

Marvick, Dwaine. "Elite Politics." American Behavioral Scientist 21 (1977): 111-134.

Masson, Jack. Alberta's Local Governments and Their Politics. Edmonton: The Pica Pica Press, 1985.

Moore, Gwen. "The Structure of a National Elite Network." American Sociological Review 44 (1979): 673-692.

Panitch, Leo V. "Elites, Classes and Power in Canada." In Canadian Politics in the 1980s 2d ed., ed. Michael S. Whittington and Glen Williams, 287-311. Toronto: Methnen

Publications, 1984.

Peters, B. Guy, John C. Doughtie, and M. Kathleen McCulloch. "Types of Democratic Systems and Types of Public Policy: An Empirical Examination." Comparative Politics 9 (1977): 327-355.

Presthus, Robert. "Interest Groups and the Canadian Parliament: Activities, Interaction, Legitimacy, and Influence." Canadian Journal of Political Science 4 (1971): 444-460.

--------. Evolution and Canadian Political Culture: The Politics of Accommodation. Paper presented at the Bi-Centennial Conference on "Revolution and Evolution: The Impact of the Revolutionary Experience of the United States Compared with the Development of Canada Solely by Evolution" at Duke University, Durham, N.C., 14-16, October 1976.

Pross, Paul A. "Pressure Groups: Talking Chameleons." In Canadian Politics in the 1980s, 2d ed., ed. Michael S. Whittington and Glen Williams, 287-311. Toronto: Methuen Publications, 1984.

Rustow, Dankwart A. "The Study of Elites: Who's Who, When and How." World Politics 18 (1966): 690-717.

Simeon, Richard. "Studying Public Policy." Canadian Journal of Political Science 9(1976): 548-580.

Stanislawski, Howard. "Elites, Domestic Interest Groups, and International Interests in the Canadian Foreign Policy Decision-making Process: The Arab Economic Boycott of Canadians and Canadian Companies Doing Business with Israel." Ph.D. diss., Bradeis University, 1981.

Walker, Jack L. "A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy." American Political Science Review 60 (1966): 285-295.

**Books**

Banfield, Edward C. Political influence. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Beck, Carl and James Malloy. Political Elites: A Mode of Analysis. Pittsburgh: University Center for International Studies, 1971.

Bogdan, Robert, and Steven J. Taylor. Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Clement, Wallace. The Canadian Corporate Elite: An Analysis of Economic Power. Toronto: McClelland and Steware, 1975.

Coplin, William D. and Michael K. O'Leary. Analysing Public Policy Issues. Croton-on-Hudson, New York: Policy Studies Association, 1978.

Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Homans, George Casper. Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1961.

Lijphart, Arend. The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1968.

--------. Democracy in Plural Societies. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Lofland, John and Lyn H. Lofland. Analysing Social Settings. 2nd Edition. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1984.

Lowi, Theodore J. The End of Liberalism. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1969.

McMenemy, John. The Language of Canadian Politics: A Guide to Important Terms and Concepts. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons Canada Ltd., 1980.

McRae, Kenneth D., ed. Consociational Democracy: Political Accommodation in Segmented Societies. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1974.

Merton, R.K., M. Fiske, and P.L. Kendall. The Focussed Interview. Glencoe, Illinoi: Free Press, 1956.

Michels, Robert. Political Parties. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.
Mosca, Gaetano. The Ruling Class. Edited by Livingston. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

Olsen, Dennis. The State Elite. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980.

Pareto, Vilfredo. Vilfredo Pareto: Sociological Writings. Translated by Derick Mirfin. New York: Praeger, 1966.

Parry, Geraint. Political Elites. London: George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd., 1969.

Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Presthus, Robert. Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1973.

--------. Elites in the Policy Process. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Pross, A. Paul, ed. Pressure Group Behavior in Canadian Politics. n.p.: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1975.

Putnam, Robert D. The Comparative Study of Political Elites. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Thompson, Fred, and W.T. Stanbury. The Political Economy of Interest Groups in the Legislative Process in Canada. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1979.

Van Loon, Richard J., and Michael S. Whittington. The Canadian Political System: Environment, Structure, and Process. Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1981.

Yin, Robert K. Case Study Research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

**Book Reviews**

Alexander, Alan. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Political Studies 22 (1974): 125-126.

Courtney, John C. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In American Political Science Review 69 (1975): 1497-1499.

Falcone, David. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In

Journal of Politics 37 (1975): 596-598.

Lang, Ronald W. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Political Quarterly 45 (1974): 259-260.

Longstaff, S.A. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 12 (1975): 235-236.

Masson, J.K. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Western Political Quarterly 27 (1974): 369-370.

Ogmundson, Rick. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Canadian Journal of Sociology 1 (1975): 240-242.

Porter, John. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Contemporary Sociology - A Journal of Reviews 4 (1975): 120-121.

Rankth, Murray. "Freedom of Information: Two Research Publications." Canadian Public Policy 5 (1979): 413-417.

Regenstreif, S. Peter. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Publius - The Journal of Federalism 4 (1974): 141-142.

Schwartz, Mildred A. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In American Journal of Sociology 80 (1975): 1071-1073.

Simeon, Richard. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Canadian Journal of Political Science 7 (1974): 567-571.

Sinclair, John. Review of Elite Accommodation in Canadian Politics, by Robert Presthus. In Social Science Quarterly 55 (1974): 551-552.

**Supplementary Materials**

Canadian Political Science Association. Theses in Canadian Political Studies, Completed and In Progress. Kingston, Ontario: Canadian Political Science Association, 1979.

--------. Theses in Canadian Political Studies, Completed and In Progress. Supplement 1971-73. Ottawa: Canadian Political Science Association, n.d.

--------. Theses in Canadian Political Studies, Completed and In Progress. Supplement 1974-77. Ottawa: Canadian Political Science Association, n.d.

Lindvall, C.M. "The Review of Related Literature." Phi Delta Kappa 40 (1959): 179-180.

Reynolds, Michael M. Guide to Theses and Dissertations: An International Bibliography of Bibliographies. Pheonix: The Oryx Press, 1985.

Sugden, Virginia M. The Graduate Thesis: The Complete Guide to Planning and Preparation. New York: Pitman Publishing Corp., 1973.

## APPENDIX I

## PRIMARY SOURCES USED IN DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

**A. Letters:**


Ausman, D., General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to C. Heide, Coordinator of Writers' Federation of Nova Scotia. March 22, 1984.

Bai, David. Chairperson of the Committee on Multiculturalism, draft letter to Edmonton City Council. Circa August, 1983.

Carter, Peter, Chairman of Edmonton Professional Arts Council and Al Iafolla, Chairman of Edmonton Cultural Caucus, to Brian Sugiyama, President of Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. February 25, 1986.

Chappelle, Margaret, President of the Federation of Canadian Artists, to the Public Affairs Committee, the City of Edmonton. August 28, 1983.

Collinson, Helen, Director of Ring House Gallery, to the Aldermen of the City of Edmonton. August 30, 1982.

Davies, Donna, Cultural Planner of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to D.M. Gamble, Director of Recreation in Ottawa. December 13, 1978.

--------, to D. Grimes, President of Metro Arts Alliance. March 17, 1980.

--------, to L. Harrison, Secretary of Arts Council of New Westminster. May 15, 1980.

Dietze, S., Commissioner of Public Affairs, to J. Cavanagh, Alderman of the City of Edmonton. Circa April, 1982.

--------, to M. Morris, Chairman of Edmonton Visual Arts Committee. July 22, 1982.

--------, Chief Commissioner, Board of Commissioners, to G. Guillet. Circa June, 1983.

Earle, G., General Manager of Executive Services,Board of Commissioners, to D. Ausman, General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 6, 1983.

Fipke, Wayne C., General Manager of the Citadel Theatre, to C. Purves, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. November 1, 1982.

Grimes, David. President of Metro Arts Alliance, to V. Kondrosky, General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. February 3, 1978.

--------,to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 10, 1980.

Guillet, G., to S. Dietze, Chief Commissioner of the Board of Commissioners. June 12, 1983.

--------, to C. Purves, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. June 12, 1983.

--------, to D. Lychak, Commissioner of Public Affairs, Board of Commissioners. Circa June, 1983.

Guy, F., Supervisor of Performing Arts, Cultural Resource Centre, Calgary Parks and Recreation, to R. Nuxoll, Director of Research and Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 9, 1979.

Hayter, Ron, Alderman of cultural policy for Edmonton, to Bill Marshall, Past President of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. March 11, 1986.

--------, Chairman of the Utilities and Finance Committee, the City of Edmonton, to Fred L. Jajczay, President of the Hungarian Cultural Society. March 20, 1985.

Hodgins, Mike, Chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, to Laurence Decore, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. December 13, 1983.

Hum, Gordon, Chairman of the Edmonton Causus Committee of Visible Minorities, open letter to Mayor Laurence Decore and City Council, the City of Edmonton. February 3, 1986.

Kinisky, Julian, Alderman of the City of Edmonton, to Brian Sugiyama, President of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. February 28, 1986.

Kondrosky, V., General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to R.J. Laing, Chairman of the Edmonton Cultural Committee. February 7, 1978.

Langford, Warren J., Director General (Intergovernmental Affairs), Arts and Culture Branch, Secretary of State, to C. Purves, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. April 26, 1978.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk, to Mike Hodgins, Chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. September 14, 1982.

Molstad, Cora, Member of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, to C.J. Purves, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. July 29, 1983.

Monroe, H., General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to Mike Hodgins, Chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. May 4, 1982.

--------, to Krishan Joshee. July 23, 1982.

--------, to C. Les Usher, Special Advisor to the Minister of Culture, Government of Alberta. August 12, 1980.

Morris, Maggie, Chairman of Edmonton Visual Arts Committee, to S. Dietze, Commissioner of Public Affiars, the City of Edmonton. July 14, 1982.

Padfield, Clive, Chairman of the Department of Movement Education, the University of Alberta, to Wanda Wetterberg, Director of Strategic Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 6, 1982.

Purves, C.J., Mayor of the City of Edmonton, to Warren J. Langford. June 6, 1978.

Schmidt, Horst, Minister of Culture, Governnment of Alberta, to Ces Purves, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. February 21, 1979.

Sugiyama, Brian, President of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, to Alderman Percy Wickman, Chairman of the Mayor's Task Force On Culture. September 17, 1985.

--------, to Laurence Decore, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. October 25, 1985.

--------, to Percy Wickman, Chairman of the Cultural Policy Implementation Committee. February 4, 1986.

--------, to Percy Wickman. March 13, 1986.

--------, to all Community Leagues Presidents. March 17, 1986.

Ukrainian Canadian Committee, to Public Affairs Committee, Edmonton City Council. September 1, 1983.

Usher, C., Special Advisor to the Minister of Culture, Government of Alberta, to Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 18, 1980.

Wetterberg, Wanda, Manager of Property Development Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to Audrey Klausen, Arts and Information, Department of Planning Development, City of North York, Ontario. January 11, 1984.

Wickman, Percy. Alderman of the City of Edmonton, to Cora Molstad, Chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. October 31, 1985.

--------, to Brian Sugiyama, President of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. February 5, 1986.

--------, to Brian Sugiyama. March 10, 1986.

Wiebe, J.E., Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Parks, Recreation and Culture Policy, to Mike Hodgins, Chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. February 15, 1982.

**B. Minutes:**

Edmonton Arts Alliance(formerly Arts Advocacy Group). Minutes of Ad Hoc Steering Committee Meeting. April, 1982.

--------, Minutes of Ad Hoc Steering Committee Meeting. April 26, 1982.

--------. Minutes of Ad Hoc Steering Committee Meeting. May 4, 1982.

Edmonton City Council. Minutes of Council Meeting. July 12, 1977.

--------. Minutes of Council Meeting. September 24, 1979.

--------. Minutes of Council Meeting. May 22, 1984.

--------. Minutes of Council Meeting. November 12, 1985.

--------. Minutes of Council Meeting. August 13, 1986.

--------. Minutes of Council Meeting. September 9, 1986.

--------. Minutes of Council Meeting. September 23, 1986.

Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. Minutes of Board Meeting. April 18, 1985.

--------. Minutes of General Meeting. January 27, 1986.

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. Minutes of Cultural Policy Sub-committee Meeting. November 12, 1981.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #330. July 14, 1982.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #331. September 29, 1982.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #334. December 8, 1982.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #336. January 19, 1983.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #337. February 2, 1983.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #338. February 16, 1983.

--------. Minutes of Meeting with Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 16, 1983.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #342. April 27, 1983.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #347. October 26, 1983.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #348. November 16, 1983.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #353. March 7, 1984.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #378. October 16, 1985.

--------. Minutes of Special Meeting on "A Policy for Culture in Edmonton". October 28, 1985.

--------. Minutes of Board Meeting #387. April 16, 1986.

Edmonton Cultural Policy Ad Hoc Committee. Minutes of Meeting #1. May 19, 1978.

--------. Minutes of Meeting #2. June 20, 1978.

--------. Minutes of Meeting #3. July 18, 1978.

--------. Minutes of Meeting #4. August 14, 1978.

Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Minutes of Executive Meeting. January 30, 1981.

--------. Minutes of Multiculturalism Workshop. August 12, 1982.

--------. Minutes of Meeting with Edmonton Visual Arts Committee. October 7, 1982.

--------. Minutes of Meeting with Edmonton Visual Arts Committee. November 10, 1982.

--------.Minutes of Meeting with Edmonton Parks and Recreation, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board and Representatives from Cultural Groups. December 1, 1982.

**C. Reports and Research Papers:**

Canadian Conference of the Arts. Municipal Spending and the Arts. March, 1981.

--------. The Third Strategy. 1984.

--------. The Arts and Local Government in the Post-Modern Economy.A Research Monograph presented to the 1987 Annual conference of the Canadian Conference of the Arts, Calgary, Alberta, May 22-23, 1987.

City of Seattle. Department of Parks and Recreation. Performing and Visual Arts. By T. Cooper. n.d.

City of Vancouver. Social Planning Department. Arts Means Business. By S. Backerman. March, 1983.

Cultural Ad Hoc Committee. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Develop a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton. Prepared by Edmonton Parks and Recreation. October 24, 1978.

Edmonton Arts Alliance. The Development of a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton. By C. Padfield. July 9, 1982.

--------. A Brief in Response to the document 'The Development of a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton - Revised June 23, 1982.'. By R. Silvester. October 8, 1982.

Edmonton City Council. Council Appointed Committee to Address the Implementation of A Policy for Culture in Edmonton. A Policy For Culture in Edmonton. (With input from Edmonton Cultural Caucus, Edmonton Professional Arts Caucus, and Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues.) 1986.

Edmonton Committee on Multiculturalism. Multiculturalism: A Component of A Cultural Policy. September 20, 1982.

Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Prepared by the Cultural Ad Hoc Committee. Cultural Policy - Second Draft. July 21, 1978.

--------. Cultural Policy - Third Draft. August 14, 1978.

--------. Cultural Services in Edmonton--Identification of Unmet Needs. 1979.

Edmonton Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development Branch.A Cultural Policy--Study Proposal. January 23, 1979.

--------. Expressions of Culture. March 2, 1979.

--------. Cultural Policy Development--Status Report. April 26, 1979.

--------. The Values of the Arts. June 26, 1979.

--------. Cultural Services in Edmonton--Identification of Unmet Needs. February 15, 1980.

--------. Cultural Services in Selected Municipalities . April 18, 1980.

--------. Cultural Arts Policy--Recommendations for Municipal Action. November 14, 1980.

--------. Civic Grants: Proposed Changes to Hosting and Travel Grant-In-Aids. November 17, 1981.

--------. 1982 Cultural Services Information. 1982.
--------. Level 3--Project Detail, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. June to August, 1982.

--------. The Development of A Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton. Revised June 23, 1982.

--------. The Development of a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton--Interim Report. Submitted to the Board of Commissioners. July 30, 1982.

--------. Cultural Policy Goal, Objectives and History. August 12, 1982.

--------. The Development of a Cultural Policy. Presented by W. Walchuk, Manager of Policy and Planning Branch. Presentation to the Workshop Multiculturalism and the Cultural Arts Policy for the City of Edmonton. September 20,1982.

--------. The Arts Policy White Paper. November 12, 1982.

--------. 1983 Capital Projects: Grant Funding. 1983.

--------. Arts White Paper. January 17, 1983.

--------. Towards an Arts Policy. Revised May 17, 1983.

--------. Management Plan--Public Workshop Results. October 24, 1983.

--------. Administration Review of the Report of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board on the Policy Paper: Toward an Arts policy.January 1, 1984.

--------. New Community Recreation/Cultural Grant Program. October 3, 1984.

--------. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton. By Wanda Wetterberg. June 17, 1985.

--------. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton--Version I and II. By Wanda Wetterberg. September 25, 1985.

--------. A Review of Local Agencies with Responsibilities Related to the Arts. By J. Peatch. September, 1985.

--------. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton. By Wanda Wetterberg. September 27, 1985.

--------. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton. By B. Anderson. October 1, 1985.

--------. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton. By B. Anderson. November 4, 1985.

--------. Strategies for Preparation of a Cultural Development Policy for Edmonton. November 17, 1986.

Edmonton Visual Arts Committee. Recommendations for the Revised City Draft of a Cultural Policy for the City of Edmonton. August 18, 1982.

Mayor's Task Force on Culture. A Cultural Policy for Edmont on. December 17, 1984.

--------. A Policy for Culture in Edmonton (with proposed revisions developed by the Edmonton Cultural Caucus and the Edmonton Professional Arts Caucus). September 27,

1985.

Milton, Laurie P. Cultural Support Spending of the City of Edmonton. A paper commissioned by Alderman G. Wright. January, 1982.

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board The Arts: A Component of the Cultural Policy. Prepared by the Culture Sub-Committee. December 5, 1983.

--------. Interim Report of the Cultural Policy Committee. November 2, 1987.

Schafer, D. Paul. Adventures in Culturescapes. n.d.

**D. Newspaper Articles:**

Edmonton Bullet.
1983. July.
1985. November.
1986. November; December.
1987. January; February; March; May; June; July.
Edmonton Journal.
1984. January.
1985. 16, 25 March; 17 May; 31 August; 26 September; 11 October.
1986. 8 January; 21 March; 4, 12 April; 16 May; 9, 26 July; 15, 29 August.

**E. Memorandum:**

1. 1977:

Anonymous, to H.J. Clark, Head of Program Resources, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Handwritten Memorandum. July 21, 1977.

Clark, H.J., Head of Program Resources, to B.K. Cooper, Manager of Recreation Services, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 13, 1977.

Leadbeater, David, Alderman, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. May 3, 1977.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk to City Commissioners, the City of Edmonton. June 16, 1977.

--------, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affiars, City of Edmonton. July 13, 1977.

--------, to Edmonton Parks and Recreation. October 14, 1977.

Savage, A.H., Commissioner of Public Affairs, to Alderman D. Leadbeater, the City of Edmonton. May 10, 1977.

--------, to C. J. McGonigle, City Clerk, the City of Edmonton. July 28, 1977.

2. 1978:

Earle, G., Manager of Administrative Support Services, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to Cultural Ad Hoc Committee. June 16, 1978.

Kondrosky, V., General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. October 27, 1978.

--------, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. November 17, 1978.

--------, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. December 21, 1978.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk, to R. Sumka, Secretary of Legislative Committee, the City of Edmonton. February 15, 1978.

--------, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. March 17, 1978.

--------, to City Commissioners, the City of Edmonton. June 13, 1978.

--------, to R. Sumka, Secretary of Legislative Committee, the City of Edmonton. November 29, 1978.

Monroe, H., General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to J.W. Langford, Director General of Arts and Culture Branch, (Intergovernmental Affairs), Secretary of State. June 6, 1978.

Savage, A.H., Commissioner of Public Affairs, to V. Kondrosky, General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. November 1, 1978.

Sumka, R. Secretary of Legislative Committee, to V. Kondrosky, General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. December 7, 1978.

3. 1979:

Alexander, G., Recreation Supervisor of North District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 2, 1979.

Anderson, B., Acting Director of Southeast District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. February 28, 1979.

--------, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 26, 1979.

Clark, H., Director of West District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 2, 1979.

Davies, Donna., Cultural Planner, to General Supervisors of Recreation Services, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 22, 1979.

--------, to H. Clark, Supervisor of Central Services, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. February 9, 1979.

--------, to Recreation Directors of all Districts, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 2, 1979.

--------, to G. Earle, Manager of Administrative Support Services, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 2, 1979.

--------, to G. Alexander, Recreation Supervisor of North District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 29, 1979.

--------, to J. Green, Recreation Supervisor of Central District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 30, 1979.

--------, to J. Morley, Director of Southwest District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 2, 1979.

--------, to K. Evans, Director of Central District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 19, 1979.

--------, to Wanda Wetterberg, General Supervisor of West District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 20, 1979.

--------, to all District Directors,Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 23, 1979.

--------, to Research and Planning staff,Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 23, 1979.

--------, to J. Feary, Public Information Officer, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 24, 1979.

--------, to G. Alexander, Recreation Supervisor of North District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. September 7, 1979.

--------, to J. Morley, Director of Southwest District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. September 7, 1979.

--------, to H. Clark, Director of West District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. September 7, 1979.

--------, to M. Vandepolder, Director of Southeast District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. September 7, 1979.

De Shane, D., Manager of Planning and Development Branch, to all managers, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 23, 1979.

--------, to all managers, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 23, 1979.

Earle, G., Manager of Administrative Services, to D. DeShane, Manager of Planning and Development, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 4, 1979.

Evans, K., Director of Central District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 5, 1979.

--------., Manager of Operations Branch, to D. DeShane , Manager of Planning and Development Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 13, 1979.

Fearey, J., Public Information Officer, to D. Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 30, 1979.

Ferguson, R., Acting General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. March 27, 1979.

Green, J., General Supervisor of Recreation of Central District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner , Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 5, 1979.

--------, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner. Edmonton Parks and Recreation . March 23, 1979.

Kelly, M.D., Director of Commonwealth Stadium, to R. Nuxoll, Director of Research and Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 27, 1979.

Kondrosky, V., General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. January 18, 1979.

Maslo, S., Director of Current Planning and Design, to R. Nuxoll, Director of Research and Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 7, 1979.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk, to Chairman of Parks and Recreaion Advisory Board, the City of Edmonton. September 28, 1979.

Meissner, B., Acting Recreation Supervisor of North District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 1, 1979.

Monroe, H., Acting General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. October 10, 1979.

Morley, J., Director of Southwest District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 26, 1979.

--------, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 7, 1979.

Nuxoll, R., Director of Research and Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to M. Kelly, Director of Commonwealth Stadium: March 30, 1979.

--------, to D. DeShane, Manager of Planning and Development, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 2, 1979.

--------, to all directors, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 23, 1979.

Schmid, Horst, A., Minister of Culture, Government of Alberta, to C.J. Purves, Mayor of the City of Edmonton. February 21, 1979.

Townsend, K., Acting Supervisor of Central Recreation Services, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 13, 1979.

Vandepolder, M., Director of Southeast District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 22, 1979.

--------, Director of Operations Branch, Southeast District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 9, 1979.

Wetterberg, Wanda, Acting Director of West District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 1, 1979.

Wyllie, A., Acting General Supervisor of Recreation of West District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 30, 1979.

4. 1980:

Borwosky, R., District Recreation Co-ordinator. Southeast District, to D. Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Circa March, 1980.

Cooper, B., Manager of Operations Branch, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton

Parks and Recreation. April 13, 1980.

Davies, Donna., Cultural Planner, to R. Borowsky, District Recreation Coordinator of Southeast District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 27, 1980.

DeShane, D., Manager of Planning and Development, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 31, 1980.

--------, to G. Earle, Manager of Administrative Services, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 31, 1980.

Earle, G., Manager of Administrative Services, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. February 28, 1980.

--------, Acting General Manager, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. August 1, 1980.

--------. Manager ofAdministrative Services, to R. Nuxoll, Director of Research and Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 22, 1980.

Green, J., General Supervisor of Recreation of Central District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 29, 1980.

Hudson, D., Director of North District, to R. Nuxoll, Director of Research and Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 12, 1980.

Monroe, H., General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. June 12, 1980.

Morley, J., Director of Southwest District, to J. Green, General Supervisor of Recreation, Central District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 7, 1980.

Romanowski, E., Supervisor of Recreation Planning, to G. Alexander, Recreation Supervisor of North District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 31, 1980.

St. Amand, S., District Recreation Co-ordinator of West District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 7, 1980.

Strickland, G.N., General Supervisor of Recreation, Southwest District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. September 4, 1980.

Tolmie-Thompson, J., District Recreation Co-ordinator of West District, to Donna Davies, Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 27, 1980.

Wetterberg, Wonda, General Supervisor of Recreation, West District, to J. Green, General Supervisor of Recreation, Central District, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 6, 1980.

5. 1981:

DeShane, D., Manager of Planning and Development, to Executives of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 9, 1981.

--------, to Executives of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 26, 1981.

--------, Acting General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A.H. Savage,

Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. February11, 1981.

--------, to A.H. Savage, Commisssioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. February 12, 1981.

Fletcher, T.H., Acting Manager of Policy and Planning Branch, to B.T. Monaghan, Acting Director of Operations Resource and Analysis, Operations Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 27, 1981.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk, to Edmonton Parks and Recreation, and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. September 8, 1981.

Moir, S., Acting Director of Research and Planning, to D. DeShane, Manager of Planning and Development, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 27, 1981.

Monaghan, B.T., Acting Director of Operations Resource and Analysis, to T. Fletcher, Acting Manager of Policy and Planning Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 26, 1981.

Monroe, H. General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. April 7, 1981.

--------, to A.H. Savage, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. May 20, 1981.

Savage, A.H., Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 18, 1981.

--------, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 14, 1981.

6. 1982:

Armstrong, J.L., Executive Assistant to the Commissioner of Public Affairs, to H. Monroe, General Manager of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 3, 1982.

Campbell, D.T., Chief Corporate Planning Officer, Corporate Policy Planning Office, to S. Dietze, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. August 17, 1982.

Dietze, S., Commissioner of Public Affairs, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 19, 1982.

--------, to Alderman G. Wright, the City of Edmonton. Circa September 27, 1982.

--------, to B. Gordeyko, Community Liaison Co-ordinator, Board of Commissioners. October 13, 1982.

Earle, G., General Manager of Executive Services, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 18, 1982.

Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to Citizens involved or interested in Performing Arts in Edmonton. February 19, 1982.

Kelly, M.D., Manager of Major Facilities Branch, to B.T. Monaghan, Acting Manager of Operations Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 21, 1982.

Lorberg, E., social/Cultural Planner, to Wanda Wetterberg, Edmonton Parks and Recreation.

April 21, 1982.

--------, to Executives, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. June 2, 1982.

--------, to Wanda Wetterberg, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. August 20, 1982.

McAully, J.K., General Manager, Finance Department, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 6, 1982.

--------, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation . July 26, 1982.

McBeath, J.E., Acting General Manager, Edmonton Social Services, to Wanda Wetterberg, Director of Policy and Planning Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 15, 1982.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk, to A. Szchechina, Grants Coordinator, Finance Department. February 24, 1982.

Milne, D.R., Senior Corporate Planning Officer, Corporate Policy and Planning Office, to W. Walchuk, Manager of Policy and Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 15, 1982.

Mix, D., Director of Policy Planning Section, Policy, Planning and Research Branch, Real Estate and Housing Department, to Wanda Wetterberg, Director, Policy and Planning Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 19, 1982.

--------, to V. Richards, General Manager, Edmonton Public Library. July 12, 1982.

--------, to D. Lychuk, General Manager, Planning Department. July 12, 1982.

--------, to S. Dietze, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. September 10, 1982.

--------, to S. Dietze, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. September 29, 1982.

---------, to S. Dietze, Commissioner of Public Affairs, the City of Edmonton. October 8, 1982.

Richards, V., General Manager, Edmonton Public Library, to H. Monroe,General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 16, 1982.

Vandepolder, M., Acting Executive Assistant to the Commissioner of Public Affairs, to H. Monroe, Genreal Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 26, 1982.

Walchuk, W., Manager of Policy and Planning, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 11, 1982.

Walchuk, W., Manager, Policy and Planning Branch, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 11, 1982.

---------, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation; Mike Hodgins, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board; and J. Wiebe, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. January 15, 1982.

Walchuk, W., Manager of Policy and Planning Branch, to Executive Board Members, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 12, 1982.

Wetterberg, Wanda, Director of Strategic Planning, Policy and Planning Branch, to E. Lorberg Social/Cultural Planner, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 20, 1982.

--------, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to M. Hodgins, Chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. June 28, 1982.

--------, to J. Learney, Director of Travel Development, Business Development Department. July 6, 1982.

--------, to B. Peters, Administrator of Social Planning, Social Services Department. July 12, 1982.

--------, to D. Mix, policy planning Section, Real Estate and Housing Department. July 12, 1982.

--------, to P. Moric, Divisional Controller of Controllors Branch, Finance Department. July 12, 1982.

--------, to all District General Supervisors of Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 13, 1982.

--------, to Managers of all Branches, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. December 29, 1982.

7. 1983:

Bucci, John, Supervisor of Grants Section, to Branch Managers, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. December 9, 1983.

Campbell, D.T., Chief Corporate Planning Officer, Corporate Policy Planning Office, to H. Monroe, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 13, 1983.

Cooper, B.K., Manager of Operations Branch, to D. DeShane, Manager of Property Development Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 13, 1983.

Dietze, S., Chief Commissioner, Board ofCommissioners, to A.C. Beaulieu, Acting Commissioner of Public Affairs. February 17, 1983.

Dube, A.S., General Manager, the City of Edmonton, to D. Lychak, Acting Commissioner, Board of Commissioners. January 26, 1983.

Dube, A.S., General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A. Beaulieu, Acting Commissioner of Public Affairs, Board of Commissioners. May 17, 1983.

Leger, E.H., Alderman, city Council, to G. Rumbold, Secretary of Public Affairs Committee. September 29, 1983.

Padfield, Clive, General Supervisor of the Culture and Special Services Unit, to Wanda Wetterberg, Director of Strategic Planning, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. October 19, 1983.

Peatch, Jane, to Wanda Wetterberg, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. July 22, 1983

Purves, C.J., Mayor of the City of Edmonton, to All Aldermen. July 7, 1983.

Rumbold, G., Secretary of Public Affairs Committee, to various Departments, the City of Edmonton. August 19, 1983.

--------, to D. Ausman, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. September 7, 1983.

--------, to D. Ausman, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. December 22, 1983.

Walchuk, W., Manager of Policy and Planning Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to G. Rumbold, Public Affairs Secretary, Office of the City Clerk. July 28, 1983.

--------, to G. Rumbold, Public Affairs Secretary, Office of the City Clerk. August 9, 1983.

Wetterberg, Wonda, Acting Manager of Policy and Planning Branch, to E. Lorberg, Social and Cultural Policy Analyst, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. January 18, 1983.

--------, to D. Lychak, Acting Commissioner of Public Affairs, Board of Commissioners. January 27, 1983.

--------, to A. Dube, Acting General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. February 21, 1983.

8. 1984:

Ausman, D., General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to D. Lychak, Assistant City Manager, the City of Edmonton. February 2, 1984.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk, to Laurence Decore, Mayor, the City of Edmonton, and Alderman Percy Wickman. May 22, 1984.

Wetterberg, Wanda, Manager of Development Branch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to D. Lychuk, Assistant City Manager, the City of Edmonton. February 2, 1984.

--------, to all members of the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. March 1, 1984.

Wickman, Percy, Alderman, to Laurence Decore, Mayor, the City of Edmonton. May 18, 1984.

9. 1985:

Ausman, D., General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation, to A. Konye, City Solicitor, Office of the City Solicitor, and J.K. McAully, General Manager, Finance Department, the City of Edmonton. April 23, 1985.

Bara, Jean, Acting Executive Secretary, Executive Committee, to D. Lychak, Acting City Manager, the City of Edmonton. February 8, 1985.

Haytor, Ron, Alderman, to the Mayor and members of Council, the City of Edmonton. November 5, 1985.

Marshall, Brian, President of the Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues, to all Community Leagues and Area Council Presidents. May 6, 1985

McAully, J.K., General Manager, Finance Department, to D. Lychak, Acting City Manager, the City of Edmonton. February 13, 1985.

--------, to D. Ausman, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 8, 1985.

McGonigle, C.J., City Clerk, to M. Mounteer, Boards and Committee; Alderman Percy Wickman; D.G. Romano, Council Agenda Secretary. November 13, 1985.

Molstad, Cora, Chairman of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board, to the Mayor and City Council, the City of Edmonton. October 28, 1985.

Peatch, Jane, Policy Planner of the Development Branch, to Executives, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. February 25, 1985.

--------, to Wanda Wetterberg and Ellen Edwards, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. April 23, 1985.

--------, to Wanda Wetterberg, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 29, 1985.

Szechechina, Alex, City Grants Co-ordinator, Finance Department, to J.K. McAully, Acting City Manager, the City of Edmonton. October 22, 1985.

Walker, Reagan, Barrister and Solicitor, Office of the City Solicitor, to Wanda Wetterberg, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. February 7, 1985.

--------, to D. Ausman,General Manger, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 7, 1985.

--------, to D. Ausman, General Manager, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. May 24, 1985.

Wick, Gordon, to Jane Peatch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. March 12, 1985.

10. 1987:

Cardinal, Donna, Edmonton Parks and Recreation to Cultural Policy Sub-committee of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. June 4, 1987.

**F. Miscellaneous Documents:**

Allsopp, B., and V. Manasc, Directors of The Design Workshop, to J. Peatch, Edmonton Parks and Recreation. Typewritten Document Signed. August 12, 1983.

Brian Webb Dance Company. Response to 'Towards an Arts Policy'. Circa September 1983.

The City of Edmonton Bylaw No. 4895. September 9, 1981.

--------. 1983 Budget. "Grants-In-Aid Program (Athletic and Recreational): Statement of Program Goals." 1983.

--------. 1983 Budget. "Grants-In-Aid (Cultural): Statement of Program Goals." 1983.

--------. Press Release. "City Requests Arts Submissions." August5, 1983.

--------. Bylaw No. 7747. February 12, 1985.

Corporate Policy Planning Office. "Status Notes for CBC Television Presentation On Administrative and Political Processes at City Hall--1983 03 24." March 18, 1983.

Edmonton Arts Alliance( formerly the Arts Advocacy Group). "Agenda of Ad Hoc Steering Committee Meeting." May 4, 1982.

Edmonton Parks and Recreation.Recreation Services Branch, to Alderman D. Leadbeater.

October 26, 1977.

--------. Cultural Policy Goals and Objectives. 1979.

--------. Mailing List (Internal). Circa 1979.

--------. "Notes on Legislative Committee Meeting." Handwritten. February 6, 1979.

--------. "Notes from Directors (Operations) Meetings." Handwritten. February 21, 1979.

--------. The Value of the Arts--Summary of Comments. Circa September, 1979.

--------. "Notes on planning meeting held to set up Workshop for the Performing Atts Groups and Staff Members of Edmonton Parks and Recreation." Circa February, 1982.

--------. "Outline for Progress Report on Cultural Policy Development." Circa June 1982.

--------. Arts Policy--Outline for the Proposed White Paper (Draft #2). September 15, 1982.

--------. Towards an Arts Policy--History. Paper submitted to Acting Commissioner of Public Affairs. April, 1983.

--------. "List of Names to be sent information regarding Public Hearings for Arts White Paper." July,1983.

--------. "Notes on Public Affairs Committee Meeting to gather Public Response to Towards an Arts Policy." August 22, 1983.

<&b>--------. "Notes on Towards an Arts Policy Public Hearing." September 5, 1983.

--------. "Fact Sheet-Review of the Advisory Board's Arts Paper." March 5, 1984.

--------. "Agenda of Workshop On A Cultural Arts Policy For the City of Edmonton: The Visual Arts Component." May 15, 1982.

--------. "Schedule-Cultural Policy Development Process." June 22, 1982.

--------. "Schedule of Cultural Policy Development Process." July 3, 1982.

--------. "Cultural Policy--Notes for Presentation to General Managers." July 9, 1982.

--------. "Work Session On the Multicultural Component in the Cultural Policy--Agenda." August 12, 1982.

--------. "Notes on Discussing Funding for the Professional Visual Arts and Theatre Arts." October 6, 1982.

--------. "Arts Policy--Outline for the Proposed White Paper." October 8, 1982.

--------. "Revised Timeline of 'White Paper on the Arts Policy." October 27, 1982.

--------. "Towards An Arts Policy: Flow Chart for Review by Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board." July 5, 1983.

--------. "Summary of Comments from the Law Department and Finance Department on

the Cultural Policy." Circa February, 1985.

--------. "Notes from Meeting with Percy Wickman." May 29, 1985.

--------. "Notes on Discussion with Reagon Walker." September 24, 1985.

--------. "Notes on Discussion with Ted Edwards." September 27, 1985.

--------. Cultural Policy Project--Project Description. 1988.

Edmonton Professional Arts Caucus. "Press Release-
Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues. Edmonton Cultural Policy Committee: Observations and Recommendations. October 7, 1985.

Arts Caucus Report on 'Cultural Policy'."July 18, 1985.

Finance Department, the City of Edmonton. City Policy--Awarding of Grants-in-Aid to Organizations or Individuals. June 24, 1980

--------. "Grants-in-Aid #54." By Alex Szechechina. November 18, 1985.

Government of Alberta. "News Release--New CRC Grant Program." September 26, 1984.

Haytor, Ron. "Notice of Motion." April 8, 1986.

Lorberg, E. "Some Comments of the Cultural Policy Background Papers." Circa May 1982.

Morris, Maggie, Chairman of Edmonton Visual Arts Committee, to the Public Affairs Committee, the City of Edmonton. Typewritten Document Signed. August 12, 1983.

Paisley, Brian, Artistic Director of Chinook Touring Theatre, to the Public Affairs Committee, the City of Edmonton. Typewritten Document Signed. August 15, 1983.

Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board. "Agenda of Cultural Policy: Format for Meeting of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board." June 22, 1982.

--------. "Agenda of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board Meeting." June 22, 1982.

--------. Cultural Policy Committee Name List. 1987.

--------. "Notes of Meeting #01--Cultural Policy Sub-Committee." May 26, 1987.

Riskin, Mary W., Executive Director of The Writers Guild of Alberta, to the Public Affairs Committee, the City of Edmonton. Typewritten Document Signed. August 15, 1983.

Utilities and Finance Committee, the City of Edmonton. "Statement of Chairman Ron Haytor to the Utilities and Finance Committee." March 19, 1985.

Walchuk, Walter. Notes on Public Affairs Meeting. July 18, 1983.

**G. Speeches:**

Padfield, Clive. "A Blueprint for the Future: The Municipal Arts Policy." Speech presented at the Edmonton Parks and Recreation Workshop for the Performing Arts. March 1983.

--------. "Initial thoughts on a Municipal Arts Policy for Edmonton." Paper prepared for the Edmonton Arts Alliance. June, 1982.

## APPENDIX III

## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

date

Dear --------,

Under the auspices of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies at the University of Alberta, I am presently conducting a study as my Master's thesis to examine the evolution of the cultural policy for Edmonton. It is the aim of this study to look at the cultural policy process as a result of the contribution, conflict and cooperation among significant groups and individuals. In order to obtain information on this, your knowledge and assistance are very important since you have been intimately involved with the development of the cultural policy.

The objective of this study is to explain the development of the cultural policy for Edmonton through identifying the groups and individuals that were involved in the process and the interaction among them which influenced the direction of the policy development. It is hoped that a better understanding of the dynamics of policy making may lead to more informed involvement of both the government and interested parties in the future.

So far, I have examined extensively the documentation related to the cultural policy in the last 12 years. I hope to collect additional information from you in an focussed interview lasting about 30 to 45 minutes. All your answers will be kept confidential. If you have no objections, I would like to tape record the interview. It is mainly a matter of convenience, and it also safeguards against incomplete and inaccurate note taking.

Shortly after you receive this letter, I will be contacting you by phone to make an appointment to meet with you at your convenience. If you have any questions, please contact me at 492-5503 (day) or 433-9241 (evening).

Sincerely yours,

Tiffany Tsang

c.c. Dr. Thomas L. Burton, Thesis Advisor, Department of Recreaton and Leisure Studies
Dr. Guy Swinnerton, Chairman, Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies

## APPENDIX II

## INTERVIEW GUIDE

Thank you for participating in this interview. I would like to emphasize that all your comments will be kept in strict confidence. That is, while I will be using the information you provide in my thesis, nothing will be attributed to you personally.

If it's agreeable to you, I would prefer to tape record this conversation. It's a matter of convenience for me, and I can make sure I won't be missing anything important. However, if you would prefer, I can take notes with pen and paper during our interview. The option is yours.

(Wait for response)

First of all, I would like to tell you in brief what are the two main areas of interest of my thesis. First, I am interested in finding out the contribution of significant actors to the development of the cultural policy in Edmonton. By actors, I mean groups or individuals who have actively taken part in formulating, supporting or opposing the cultural policy proposals in the course of their development. Second, I am interested in finding out the patterns of interaction, communication, competition and cooperation among these actors in the policy process and the effects they have had on the policy direction. I realize that the cultural policy has been an ongoing process. Therefore, I have decided to concentrate my research time frame from 1978 to around October, 1986. That was the time when the Bylaw for the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Advisory Board was amended to expand its responsibilities. Therefore, I would appreciate it if you would keep that in mind when making your comments. However, if you feel it's crucial, you may also make reference to the Cultural Futures Project which is the most recent phase of development.

I would like to break down these two aspects of my study into a series of questions. There are 5 major items that I would like you to address. Please feel free to take as much time as you want to respond to each of them. You are also welcome to ask me to clarify any question that is not clear to you.

In front of you is a copy of the questions I am about to ask you. It is just a visual aid to help you keep track of the questions as we go along. It's up to you to refer to it or not.

(Hand out question sheet to interviewee)

If you are ready, let's begin.

1. Subject's Background Information relating to His/Her Involvement with the cultural policy

   a. Can you recall when and how you began to get actively involved in the cultural policy ?
   b. When did you last participate in it?
   c. What role or roles did you play during the time you were involved?

2. Subject's knowledge of the communication patterns in the policy process

   a. Can you remember how you were involved?
   b. How were your ideas about the cultural policy communicated?
   c. Who were the people that you communicated with? This can be both formal and informal communication to individuals and groups.
   d. How do you see the way or ways other people get their ideas across?
   e. How do you feel about the communication process?

3. Subject's insight into the process of elite accommodation

   a. Are you aware of differences in opinions among the actors in the policy process?
   b. Can you recall some of the general and specific issues involved?
   c. Were these issues resolved?
   d. If they were, how were they resolved?
   e. What happen to the unresolved issues?

4. Subject's assessment of changes in policy direction

   a. Can you recall any significant changes in policy direction during these years?
   b. Can you give some specific examples?
   c. Why do you think these changes were significant?
   d. What do you think were the major reasons for these changes?

5. Subject's general assessment of the policy process

   a. Do you think any particular people or group have benefited directly from the cultural policy development?
   b. What do you think needs to be done differently in the future if the cultural policy is to be kept up to date?